

## **HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE ASSESSMENT IN UKRAINE AND MOLDOVA**

---

*Prepared by:*

**Jeffrey Clark  
David Rhoad**

*Submitted to:*

**USAID/Kiev  
AEP-I-00-00-00023-00  
Task Order No. 800**



*Submitted by:*

**Development Associates, Inc.**  
*1730 North Lynn Street  
Arlington, VA 22209-2023  
Telephone: (703) 276-0677  
Fax: (703) 276-0432  
E-mail: devassoc1@devassoc1.com*

**April 11, 2001**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>FOREWORD.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. JUSTIFICATION FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
IS CONTINUED HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN THE WESTERN NIS NEEDED AND JUSTIFIED? .....	7
<b>III. PROGRAM RESPONSE TO NEED .....</b>	<b>10</b>
IS USAID'S HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE STRATEGY VIS A VIS CHAP RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF THE MOST VULNERABLE POPULATION GROUPS? .....	10
<b>IV. COUNTERPART'S IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAP.....</b>	<b>15</b>
DOES COUNTERPART'S ADMINISTRATION OF CHAP SUCCESSFULLY ADVANCE USAID HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE STRATEGIES? .....	15
<b>V. USAID SUPPORT AND PROMOTION OF CHAP.....</b>	<b>18</b>
IS THERE NEED FOR A STRONGER ROLE BY USAID IN THE OVERALL PROMOTION OF CHAP AND THE PROTECTION OF COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL IN ITS RELATIONSHIPS WITH GOVERNMENTAL MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES? .....	18
<b>VI. SPECIAL ISSUES .....</b>	<b>20</b>
DO THE CURRENT COMMODITY SELECTION AND COMMODITY VALUATION PRACTICES OPTIMALLY SERVE CHAP'S OBJECTIVES? .....	21
DOES THE DISASTER RESPONSE ELEMENT OF CHAP ADEQUATELY ADDRESS ENHANCEMENT OF HOST-COUNTRY EMERGENCY RESPONSE STRUCTURES? .....	23
DOES CHAP OFFER SUFFICIENT FOCUS ON STRENGTHENING THE CAPACITY OF HOST-COUNTRY NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS TO RESPOND TO HUMANITARIAN NEEDS? .....	23
<b>VII. THE FUTURE OF CHAP.....</b>	<b>24</b>
SHOULD USAID FUND AN EXTENSION OF CHAP AND IF SO, WHAT MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROGRAM'S DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED? .....	24
<b>VIII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>26</b>

### APPENDICIES

<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Contact List</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Assessment Team Itinerary</b>
<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>Geographic Focus</b>
<b>Appendix 4</b>	<b>Scope of Work</b>
<b>Appendix 5</b>	<b>Counterpart's Budget Summary of CHAP</b>
<b>Appendix 6</b>	<b>The History and Impact of USAID's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) implemented by Counterpart International, Inc. in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova (WESTNIS)</b>
<b>Appendix 7</b>	<b>Counterpart International's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program Response to Zakarpattia Flood, Winter – Spring 2001</b>

## **FOREWORD**

The report which follows has been composed by the two-person team of consultants fielded by Development Associates to the Western NIS in February and March, 2001, for the purpose of conducting an assessment of humanitarian assistance strategies being pursued by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in the region. The specific goals of that assessment are outlined in the introductory pages of the report.

The team members brought to their assignment a combination of skills and experiences which have resulted in a genuinely independent assessment of need and response in the humanitarian sector and have contributed a fresh approach to their mission that contained neither biases nor agendas likely to distort findings or recommendations.

The team members spent more than four weeks in the field interviewing a comprehensive grouping of host government officials, USAID officers, non-government organization leaders, international donor agency representatives and private citizens somewhat representative of the more vulnerable strata of society in Ukraine and Moldova. This rather lengthy period of time in the field followed three intensive days of consultations in Washington, D.C., with engaged officials at the U.S. Department of State, USAID, and Counterpart—implementor of the primary U.S. Government humanitarian assistance initiative in the Western NIS. The emphasis of the team's investigations in the region was in areas beyond the capital cities of Kyiv and Chisinau, an approach believed necessary to obtain an understanding of the conditions faced by communities not as prosperous as the capital cities nor as easily accessed by external donor agencies.

One immediate benefit of the extensive travel in relatively more remote regions of Ukraine and Moldova was to provide team members with a keen appreciation for the endless logistical hurdles faced by providers of assistance in the region. The limitations of the transport system and the almost surrealistic administrative burdens imposed by governmental officials at the national, regional and local levels are critical factors in effectively delivering humanitarian and development assistance that could be underestimated if not realized first hand. Reflective of such logistical complications, team members were ultimately unable to journey to Belarus as they intended; this omission was greatly regretted by the team.

The complicated itineraries followed jointly and separately by the team members required untold hours of effort on the part of Counterpart and USAID representatives engaged in facilitating the assessment effort. The team members are genuinely appreciative of the efforts made on their behalf and thankful for the efficiency and thoroughness of the travel and site visit arrangements across Ukraine and Moldova. It would have been literally impossible for the team to have gained the comprehensive view of the situation it realized without such dedicated assistance.

The report submitted by the team encompasses a wide range of discussions, conclusions and recommendations. In all cases findings and recommendations originated with the team members and no conclusions not fully supported by the team are reflected in the assessment.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The central conclusions of the independent assessment of USAID humanitarian assistance strategies and programmatic engagement in the Western NIS are straight-forward:

- Humanitarian assistance to the region is amply justified by the acute needs of large numbers of needy families and individuals living on the far margins of productive society;
- USAID's programmatic response to humanitarian need via CHAP (Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program) is rendering solid and sustained contributions that provide valuable assistance to social service institutions, communities and families in need;
- Counterpart International's implementation of CHAP is highly effective and strongly underscores dedication to the concepts of transparency and accountability;
- CHAP is an initiative, however, that suffers from insufficient strategic and geographic focus and has other defects in design that require attention;
- CHAP should be funded for an additional three year period of time and Counterpart should be continued as program administrator; and,
- USAID and Counterpart should construct an exit plan for the latter in its role as direct manager of humanitarian assistance in the region.

All of these points are addressed in detail in the body of this report. Additional topics—including the role of CHAP in responding to disaster situations, the need for greater NGO capacity building components within CHAP, the lack of donor coordination, valuation of donated commodities—are explored as well. The need for enhanced support of CHAP at the policy level by USAID and U.S. embassy officials is discussed. Background information is provided in a series of Appendices to the report.

The judgment of the assessment team is that CHAP is expertly managed and implemented. The ability of Counterpart to provide precise tracking of a heavy and diverse volume of donated commodities and to ensure compliance with formidable and ever-changing rules and regulations by host government entities well serves the interests of the U.S. Government in the region. Additionally, Counterpart has built impressive collaborative ties with a series of distribution partners and recipient organizations that directly builds local capacity in the delivery of humanitarian assistance. The development of a highly effective operational data base, and the recruitment, training, and promotion of a motivated and responsible local staff reflect particularly well upon the priority Counterpart International placed upon management expertise and business acumen in the direction of the program over the past six years.

That said, it is important to keep in perspective the limitations of a commodity import program to address the long-term structural reforms required to alleviate the suffering of the most needy people in society. CHAP now contributes valuable assistance to such people, but needs sharper and more strategic focus to enhance its sustainable impact. Thus the report calls for expanded engagement by CHAP with non-governmental organizations as commodity recipients and distributors and less of a concentration on supporting state-affiliated social service entities. Separately, the report indicates a need for CHAP to directly address local NGO capacity

building.

In summary, the assessment team concluded that strategic refocusing of CHAP is necessary if the initiative is to remain part of USAID's portfolio in the Western NIS and if it is to deliver its maximum potential contribution to the mission's overall goals and objectives in the region. The team strongly asserts, however, that the value of and need for CHAP is such that the effort required to achieve greater strategic focus is clearly warranted.

The report concludes with a recommendation that CHAP be funded for an additional three years but concurrently suggests that USAID and Counterpart be explicit in requiring that an *exit plan* be developed as a component of that extension. The rationale for that recommendation is that the indigenization of management of a program of this nature is not only possible, but desirable. Responding to the humanitarian needs of the citizenry of nations as potentially prosperous as those in the Western NIS has to be seen primarily as a local responsibility. The adoption of an exit plan for CHAP helps signal such a sentiment and can serve as evidence of the U.S. Government's and Counterpart International's joint commitment to that goal.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This document constitutes the report of the two-person team of consultants engaged by Development Associates of Arlington, Virginia, to undertake an assessment of USAID's humanitarian assistance program in the Western NIS countries of Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus under Contract OUT-AEP-800-00-00023-00, Task Order No.800, as ratified February 2, 2001. As discussed below, that contract was effectively altered on March 16, 2001, when USAID and Development Associates representatives jointly agreed that logistical constraints precluded a comprehensive site visit to an adequate number of locations pertinent to the assessment in Belarus and that a separate, follow-up assessment of humanitarian assistance requirements in that country should be conducted at a later date. Thus, the report reflects the results of the team's efforts in Ukraine and Moldova and provides no conclusions or recommendations specific to Belarus. That said, it seems highly unlikely to team members that central thrusts of the conclusions and recommendations reflected in this report would have been altered by the intended field investigation in Belarus. Findings particular to that country and its situation would have been additional but not contradictory to those provided here, it is believed.

The purpose of the assessment undertaken by the team is spelled out in the Scope of Work which formed an integral part of the contract entered into between USAID/Kyiv (which serves as the regional mission for USAID in the Western NIS) and Development Associates. The SOW is attached as Appendix 4 to this report. In short, the purpose of the assessment was to:

- Determine by country if vulnerable groups and communities continue to need external support in the form of humanitarian assistance during non-emergency periods and when natural or man-made disasters occurs;
- Determine if USAID strategy is responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable people;
- Assess whether or not the CHAP (Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program) initiative funded by USAID is responsive to the Agency's strategies regarding vulnerable people; and,
- Specifically evaluate the operations of CHAP as administered by Counterpart International, Inc., in order to inform decision-makers as to whether that program should be continued and, if so, in what form.

The objectives of the assessment can be summarized as follows:

- Examine the activities of other donors working on the provision of humanitarian assistance in the region and assess the level of coordination existing in the donor community in this area;
- Determine if the level of program funding provided CHAP is adequate to achieve the results envisioned by mission strategy;
- Examine how the CHAP program has been able to adjust to evolving needs amongst vulnerable population groups over the past six years;
- Assess the effectiveness of CHAP administration in preventing misuse and abuse of humanitarian assistance;
- Assess the collaboration between CHAP and critical governmental ministries in the

- relevant governments;
- Determine the success of CHAP administrators in supporting the efforts of U.S. and international NGOs in the provision of disaster relief and humanitarian assistance to the region as required to bolster the limited local infrastructure and local on-the-ground experience often realized by those entities; and,
- Assess the degree of success realized by CHAP in achieving the fundamental objectives and results specified in its USAID grant and the general effectiveness of program implementation.

As stated, Development Associates fielded two individuals to undertake this assessment. Both possess considerable experience and skills in areas directly relevant to the conduct of the assignment. Jeffrey Clark, team leader for the assessment, has been engaged in the humanitarian assistance field for 24 years. He has worked for USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, the House Select Committee on Hunger and a variety of NGOs and international development agencies in fifty countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America. He undertook NGO sector needs assessments in Armenia and Ukraine and was team leader of a mid-term evaluation of an NGO support program in Russia, Ukraine and Georgia. For USAID, he was co-team leader for a review of the democracy and governance program's portfolio in Ethiopia and also of an assessment of humanitarian needs in Russia and Georgia. Mr. Clark has analyzed UN humanitarian assistance efforts in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia and elsewhere. He has written numerous articles and contributed chapters to books on humanitarian assistance; his analysis of the humanitarian crisis of 1992 in Somalia appeared in *Foreign Affairs*.

Team member David Rhoad recently completed a career of almost 30 years with USAID, including extensive experience with food and humanitarian assistance programs. He is well versed in the analysis and resolution of financial management, control and accountability issues in the administration of grant and contract activities. As a Senior Foreign Service Officer, Mr. Rhoad served as Chief of the Executive Management Staff in USAID/Washington in 1999-2000. Immediately prior to that assignment, he was Deputy Mission Director in the West Bank and Gaza, supervising a project portfolio of \$75 million per year. Earlier, he served stints as Deputy Director, Office of Middle East Affairs; Africa Coordinator for the Office of Budget; Director, Office of Food and Humanitarian Assistance, USAID/Khartoum; Chief, Regional Food for Peace Office, RESDO/ESA; and Chief, Policy Analysis Division, Bureau for Food and Voluntary Assistance.

Methodology followed by team members allowed for a thorough investigation of issues of central importance to the assessment and assured an analysis of data, information, structures and processes independent of any one source. Team members reviewed documents pertinent to the assessment made available by USAID, the Department of State and Counterpart International prior to departure from Washington, as well as those provided in the region. The team reviewed suggested itineraries and consultations with USAID and Counterpart officials, but reserved the right—a frequently exercised right—to make alterations to the proposed schedules. While both USAID and Counterpart officials accompanied team members on some consultations, the team also reserved and exercised the right to conduct interviews *in camera*. Different interviewing techniques were employed to assure that the widest practical investigative approach to various issues was being utilized.

Team members selected various sites where humanitarian assistance had been provided through CHAP. Some of the institutions visited were current recipients, others had not received assistance for relatively long periods of time, allowing the team to observe the long-term impact on operations. Government officials interviewed in Ukraine and Moldova incorporated those highly appreciative of CHAP and those clearly more skeptical. Institutions serving the vulnerable but not recipients of CHAP aid were visited to provide a contrast with the operations of those being provided USAID-funded assistance. A number of individuals deemed to be somewhat indicative of especially needy families in various locations were visited, giving team members insight to the daily reality of individuals not well prepared to take care of their basic needs. Included in such visits were consultations in the homes of families provided disaster relief through CHAP—such as family members of coal miners killed in explosions in eastern Ukraine.

Essential to the methodology followed by the team was to retain control of the itinerary and the schedule to preclude being shown only projects deemed successful by Counterpart and to preclude being overly influenced by USAID staff members with a stake in the assessment. Team members constantly attempted to triangulate the approach to various topics to ensure a wide range of inputs. It is important to underscore here the cooperation of Counterpart officials in making the assessment as thorough and independent and rigorous as it was. The team had all requests for information, site visits and consultations honored; correspondingly, no site visits or consultations were forced onto the schedule against the intentions of the team. Never did team members have the impression that Counterpart officials were less than candid in offering a thorough and honest answer to any question asked, regardless of how provocative its nature. To the contrary, Counterpart officials gave the impression of welcoming a rigorous assessment that could provide an opportunity for strategic adjustments in the CHAP's programmatic approaches.

In the end, literally scores of individuals from a range of social service entities—whether government-supported or non-governmental in nature—as well as officials from government ministries, international donor agencies, U.S. Government agencies, and Counterpart were interviewed; in addition, business community representatives and private citizens were consulted. These interviews took place over a wide swath of territory in Ukraine and Moldova. Appendix 1 provides a partial listing of individuals interviewed; Appendix 2 denotes the itinerary followed by the team; and, Appendix 3 summarizes the geographic reach of the assessment.

As stated, the team was unable to visit Belarus as intended. The clear insistence of USAID officials in Kyiv on itineraries that assured team members perspectives on the needs of the vulnerable—an approach thoroughly concurred in by team members and one followed in Moldova as well—and a combination of logistical constraints, such as cancelled airline service, presented USAID officials in Belarus with a choice between an abbreviated schedule for the team in that country or a delayed assessment. The decision was made to conduct a separate assessment of humanitarian assistance in Belarus at a date to be determined. Team members regret the inability to proceed to Belarus as planned.

The results of the team's assessment of humanitarian needs in the Western NIS and of the



USAID-funded response to those needs follows. Various documents that support findings of the assessment are found in the report's appendices.

## II. JUSTIFICATION FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

The team explored a series of fundamental questions that framed the basic approach to the assessment and provide corresponding structure to this report. Those questions are detailed in the introduction section, but the essential topics for investigation can be summarized as:

- Is continued humanitarian assistance in the Western NIS justified?
- Are USAID strategies incorporating the CHAP program responsive to the humanitarian needs of vulnerable population groups?
- Does the administration of CHAP advance those strategies and what if any modifications in its operation are required to maximize efficiency and impact? and,
- Is an extension of CHAP operations as administered by Counterpart International, Inc., merited and necessary?

The first of these core questions is briefly examined below. Expanded discussions of the multiple complexities surrounding these central questions are found in subsequent sections of the report.

### **Is continued humanitarian assistance in the Western NIS needed and justified?**

**Discussion:** The definition of humanitarian need in Ukraine and Moldova varies widely. It encompasses the family deserted by the father and now living in desperate subsistence, literally living off occasional handouts of neighbors, unable even to keep small livestock because there is no money to buy feed for the animals. It is captured in the daily recurrence of incidents at a school where teachers report students fainting at their desks because they have not had enough to eat before starting their half day of classes. Elderly pensioners who are eligible for \$18 a month may not receive the meager stipend at all, or find that a utility bill for a single month is two or three times higher than their entire income.

Geriatric care homes, orphanages, boarding schools for mentally or physically disabled children and similar institutions which provided part of the safety net under the former Soviet system struggle to meet recurrent costs of food and staff salaries with state budget allocations that may fall 60 percent or more short of projected requirements—and that until recently have been distributed erratically, often several months behind schedule. Those in direst need include the poorest members of rural communities and farm families living on the edge of subsistence who have been left without jobs or with ownership of small, unprofitable parcels of land after the failure and break-up of collective farming systems.

Whatever the definition of needs, donor estimates of more than 50 percent of the populations of these countries falling below the poverty line are subject to little challenge—except that these figures may be

underestimated. The numbers exceed 25 million in Ukraine alone; and another 3 million in Moldova. (It is interesting to note that a recent publication quotes from a public opinion survey in which some 86 percent of Ukrainians classified themselves as poor, while 13 percent thought of their financial status as average and only one percent considered themselves well-off.<sup>1</sup>)

*"The village people don't have jobs. They have no income. Some families are subsisting on animal feed." -*  
Relief Organization Official, Crimea

Distinguishing between needy populations by urban or rural locale does not appear to isolate one group as distinctly more at risk than another. The conventional response to such questions is simplistic but resonant with pragmatic truism: those in the country need clothes; those in the city need food.

The responsibility for ascertaining humanitarian needs and responding to them unfortunately is much less varied. State institutions are still seen as the primary means for treating the ills and alleviating the most severe conditions of those categorized as *vulnerable groups*—categorizations which automatically tend to frustrate targeting of those most in need. At the same time as the 10-year downturn in social and economic conditions results in more and more people being claimed by these categories, and thus becoming putative *wards of the state*, governments' fiscal and management abilities to assume a growing burden of responsibility are diminishing. As one director of a patient facility laconically put it: "We are a government organization that the government cannot afford to run."

The private sector response to appeals for charitable support is generally muted by a continuing struggle to achieve profitability. In-kind assistance is proffered by some, but with rare and marked exceptions such assistance is insufficient to sustain non-governmental interventions that can effectively fill the gap between needs and national, regional or local government capacities to meet them.

There is a growing number of social welfare-oriented non-government organizations (NGOs) in Ukraine and Moldova, although many are still dependent on implicit or even explicit raion or district government largesse to maintain basic operations. Space is provided in government buildings, utility bills are paid (or placed on the local authorities' account), and in some instances a small fraction of local business taxes are 'directed' to the NGO. But program resources remain largely insignificant in the face of steadily increasing numbers of needy individuals and families. The impact and reach of such NGOs remain marginal relative to need.

Likewise, there are various assistance programs supported by international donors, either official aid agencies or NGOs. Some of the official aid agencies are, however, turning away from humanitarian assistance interventions and concentrating on longer-term development strategies. This development is one largely stemming from a sense that there is no plausible end game and that the humanitarian crises of the region are destined to repeat themselves until economic

<sup>1</sup> Eastern Economist, March 26–April 1, 2001.

development accelerates. The impact of international NGO efforts would appear to vary widely, with numerous well-targeted and well-designed programs operating along side more scattered and loosely monitored ones. There are, however, a growing number of NGOs and development agencies that have sharpened their focus in the humanitarian sphere. More complementary approaches between such groups and USAID offer the potential of expanded impact.

There is a distinct sub-category of relief assistance that is repeatedly being channeled to the victims of recurring natural and man-made disasters in Ukraine and Moldova. While there

*"Many organizations come to us, talk to us, look around, take pictures, then leave...and we never hear from them again. Perhaps we should start a tourism industry." - Moldovan relief official*

is an infrastructure of emergency response services in the two countries, based in part on the former Soviet government's concerns with civil defense needs, ageing equipment and depleted stockpiles of the medical and other supplies required to respond to disasters inhibit the efficacy of these services. Immediate response services aside, the social and economic costs of dealing with the humanitarian needs created by disasters represent an unrealizable call upon government resources patently unable to meet recurrent budget costs. Consequently, donor countries and external aid agencies have come to serve as the necessary reservoir of resources for disaster mitigation. But in a region still painfully aware of the danger and damage caused by the 1986 Chernobyl disaster, and one becoming increasingly cognizant of a growing list of new environmental hazards posed by a 'rust belt' of deteriorating, or even totally abandoned, industrial complexes, the ability to respond effectively to the needs of those who are victimized by emergencies must remain a high priority of governments and donors alike.

**Conclusions:** The assessment team struggled with the definition of humanitarian need and of *community and humanitarian assistance* as the terms are applied in the Western NIS context, both by local entities and USAID. Many of the problems discussed here and targeted through the CHAP initiative are serious developmental challenges with acute impact on the lives of desperately poor individuals. The effective addressing of those problems rests ultimately in structural reforms and long-term sustainable development interventions, however, not through the provision of humanitarian assistance. The definitional issue as it effects the implementation of CHAP is explored in detail elsewhere in this report.

The conclusion of the team is that despite a distortion of the term humanitarian assistance and the problems of clarity in monitoring and evaluating impact that stem from such distortion, assistance deemed to be humanitarian is valid and justified in the Western NIS at present and that USAID resources should continue to be allocated for such purposes. The individuals most at peril due to lack of resources should not be penalized for the failures of government in tackling serious structural reforms in the political and economic spheres, not should they be held prisoner to the theories of external development assistance strategists. The reality is that for untold millions of people, life is considerably more fragile and harsh than it was during even the darkest days of the Soviet system. Savings and resources have been totally depleted for many; jobs are scarce or non-existent. The social safety net is frayed and deteriorating. People—too many people to ignore—are in grave danger of a total collapse of their support systems and require assistance if they are to survive.

A question frequently asked by the assessment team members—of government officials, NGO representatives, donor agency officials, social service institution managers, private citizens—was whether conditions for the most vulnerable were seen to be improving, deteriorating or static. The answer offered most often was a

clear declaration that conditions were worse than three or so years ago and that people's reserves of resources were declining. The survey was clearly not scientific, but it does indicate at least a widespread perception that conditions are worsening for many citizens.

*"We are seeing a trend toward the increasing institutionalization of children, which places a greater burden on state institutions. Poverty is growing, but the demands on state institutions—orphans, for example—are growing faster."*

- Donor Organization Representative, Moldova

The ability of the United States Government to respond to such need is and will remain limited. The priority utilization of the limited development assistance available for the region has to be on long-term development interventions that hold at least the potential of positively impacting the economic transformation required for Ukrainian and Moldovan societies to more adequately care for their vulnerable citizens. That said, there are moral, economic and political arguments to be made for continuing humanitarian assistance programs in the Western NIS.

**Recommendation:** It is an unambiguous recommendation of the assessment team that humanitarian assistance remain a strong thrust of USAID programming in the Western NIS. And, as detailed elsewhere, it is recommended that steps be taken to sharpen the focus of humanitarian interventions to ensure enhanced impact in this sector.

### III. PROGRAM RESPONSE TO NEED

**Is USAID's humanitarian assistance strategy vis a vis CHAP responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable population groups?**

**Discussion:** USAID/Kyiv's strategic priorities emphasize fundamental governmental reforms and invigoration of the private sector through a number of medium-to-long term development programs. As these interventions achieve impact over time, they will address the most frequently articulated need of those interviewed by the assessment team: the creation of employment opportunities. Within Strategic Assistance Area 3 (Social Transition), mission programs also include a health sector initiative for *Improved Health Care Service Delivery*, another frequently cited area of need. Other programs in this Strategic Assistance Area within the SO 3.4 category of aid activities for *Mitigation of Adverse Social Impacts of the Transition to Market-based Democracies* incorporate a range of activities aimed at improving the efficiency of the public sector's delivery of social services, the provision of needed services to vulnerable groups by NGOs, and the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

The Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) is a stand-alone project, for both funding and project management purposes, under the latter designation of humanitarian assistance. Past annual funding levels for the project in the \$1,000,000 range represent less than two percent of USAID/Kyiv's operating year budget. As buy-ins to the regionally-organized project, similarly modest percentages of annual funding have been committed to CHAP within

the USAID/Chisinau and USAID/Minsk budgets. Cumulative funding (including estimated commitments to the end of the current grant agreement in June 2001) for the six-year-old project, including the Moldovan and Belarus country buy-ins, totals \$10.1 million.

A USAID/Kyiv statement of CHAP's purposes includes the following:

- to respond to disasters as they occur and develop an emergency response capability among both governmental and non-governmental rescue organizations;
- to support the most vulnerable groups—disaster victims, the elderly, the disabled, children and youth, sick people, the destitute, veterans, private farmers, etc;
- to accelerate the institutional development of qualified local social service and rescue non-governmental organizations (NGOs) by providing humanitarian assistance and infrastructural support to them and their constituents;
- to support governmental social service providers such as hospitals, schools, orphanages, and boarding homes for the elderly and disabled; and,
- to support other U.S. PVOs attempting to provide humanitarian assistance to needy populations in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.

The project is implemented under a grant agreement with Counterpart International, a 35-year-old, U.S.-based NGO, which acquires, transports and consigns commodities to local NGOs, designated as *distribution partners*, in 11 countries, including Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.<sup>2</sup> In the past year, 70 percent of these commodities were obtained from surplus Department of Defense supplies, ranging in nature from socks and shoes to gasoline-powered generating sets to specialized vehicles for firefighting and heavy haulage. The remaining 30 percent of transported and distributed commodities originated from private sector donations, including used clothing, pharmaceuticals, computers and vegetable seeds.

Food commodities are not commonly included in Counterpart operations, although emergency food rations, such as military meals-ready-to-eat (MREs) or civilian Humanitarian Daily Rations (HDRs), have been shipped, generally for use in disaster response situations. Except for oversized vehicles, all commodities are shipped in 20- or 40-foot containers. Most are shipped from U.S. or Western European ocean ports, but use of the containers also facilitates overland or airlift transportation as warranted.

Counterpart has developed a highly sophisticated matching and tracking system for containerized commodities (see section below) that facilitates targeting of assistance to vulnerable groups and provides remarkably precise accountability for shipping and distribution purposes. The unique expertise in shipping commodities that Counterpart and its local distribution partners have developed serves to support other U.S. NGO assistance efforts, private donations, a variety of Department of State and Department of Defense initiatives, and a rapid response capability for the U.S. Government to natural or other disasters that all too frequently affect the region.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus—commonly referred to as a WESTNIS in official and Counterpart jargon—are the only countries where USAID directly funds country operations of the CHAP project. In other countries, the Department of State is the funding agency for CHAP.

Most commodities shipped by Counterpart under the CHAP project either directly address the needs of those who are most vulnerable in the population or of those of institutions that seek to provide them with necessary assistance. Commonly distributed items include a wide range of clothing, medical equipment and specialized furniture, medical supplies, sleeping bags and bedding. Warm clothing in a region subject to harsh winter conditions clearly has utility in health protection and for employment purposes; such clothing assumes even greater importance for families or individuals unable to pay rising utility costs, or in some cases without access to reliable means of heating. Pharmaceuticals, including vitamins, and medical equipment also rank high on recipient lists of most needed or utilizable commodities. Dentistry equipment, hospital beds, and bedding all are enthusiastically welcomed at care facilities which rarely have funds to replace outdated or worn furnishings.

Some commodities have been markedly successful in generating income and employment opportunities. Tons of uncut cloth fabric have been distributed to schools and residential care institutions throughout Ukraine where the materials have been converted into uniforms or drapes or furniture coverings by students/residents learning the crafts necessary to produce these products, and for recipients often badly in need of clothes.

*"I am not asking for more aid from CHAP. I am grateful for what has been provided, and I do not want to appear greedy. I want to believe things will get better." -*

District Hospital Administrator, Ukraine

Commercial-sized bread ovens shipped from a closed defense facility today supply bread for the institutions where they were installed, as well as for other needy organizations in their districts. Administrators now see opportunities to produce bakery products from these ovens that can be sold on the local market, generating income that will go toward meeting the needs of patients or others in the community who require assistance. A generator set, formally given to one farmer, helps an informal association of some 400 farm families in northern Moldova operate a small milk collection and cooling plant that sells to commercial dairies. The payout from this operation accounts for 10-15 percent of the farming association's annual income.

In other cases, commodities provided through the CHAP project may stretch common understanding of "urgent need", or have proven unfortunate in their ultimate disposition, even though they fall within the technical use parameters of the program's stated purposes. Illustratively:

- A 21-year old fire truck delivered to the Chisinau airport incorporates technical features which will upgrade the capabilities of emergency firefighting services at the airport, but these have rarely been on call and are adequately, if only modestly, equipped with 10- and 13-year old pumper fire trucks of Soviet-era manufacture. In a meeting with officials of the Moldovan Humanitarian Assistance Commission, and in subsequent discussion of shipment of the fire truck with Counterpart staff, it became apparent to the team that questions had been raised and were still unresolved concerning the official import status of the vehicle as an item of humanitarian assistance.
- A six ton shipment of donated vegetable seeds, found infested on arrival in Moldova, has

created a bureaucratic furor over the adequacy of inspection procedures followed in transporting the seeds, and confusion over the necessity for their destruction. Questions also have arisen over the utility and appropriateness of the seed selection.

Arguably, these are two cases where the intended benefits of the commodities appear to have been outweighed by costs in the resources expended and in possible misunderstandings of CHAP's primary purpose(s) in focusing on the needs of the most vulnerable groups in the region. Appreciation of CHAP's role and purposes, including the function of Counterpart International as the implementing agency, is critical to the project's facilitation by host government authorities. In both Ukraine and Moldova, Humanitarian Assistance Commissions (HAC) comprised of representatives of relevant ministries and chaired by senior policy level officials clear every shipment of commodities brought into the country for humanitarian aid purposes. Inter-ministerial tensions and sometimes unpredictable HAC executive staff relations with donors can delay customs clearance and distribution of goods, require the diversion of donor agency staff resources to resolve issues, and in some instances provide fodder for propagandistic criticisms of foreign assistance.

The CHAP project is only as effective as its partners on the ground permit it to be. It is dependent on local NGOs to serve as consignees for the donated commodities, to propose distribution plans for delivery of the commodities to the neediest in their communities, and ultimately to represent the intent and purposes of the donor. Counterpart International reports that in the six years of the CHAP project's operation it has worked with approximately 100 local NGOs as distribution partners to reach some 5,000 recipient organizations, which in turn have delivered donated commodities to hundreds of thousands of families and individuals. The association with Counterpart in turn has given these NGOs greater legitimacy and credibility as they have been able to cite the recognition granted to them in being chosen to represent international donors, and have been able to demonstrate the significance of such recognition in tangible ways, *i.e.*, the provision of commodities directly to recipients.

Organizational and technical skills also accrue to the NGOs serving as distribution partners as they become proficient in the bureaucratic procedures for importing goods, and as they learn networking skills—and the value thereof—in order to identify cooperating organizations in their communities. The assessment team was

*"There would be disorder in this program without Counterpart as manager. We would have too much pressure for skewed distributions." -*

Distribution Partner Official, Crimea

impressed with the high energy style and strong humanitarian motivation of the staff of the partner NGOs interviewed. In several cases it was clear that their selection by Counterpart as a distribution partner was a catalytic event enabling these NGOs to significantly expand the range of their services and raise their horizon of institutional objectives.

This positive assessment of CHAP's impact on local NGOs is accompanied by two interlaced observations, however. On one hand, CHAP provides little or no direct training or support for institutional capacity building (*i.e.*, in fund raising; personnel development; budget management). On the other hand, these NGOs collectively represent an invaluable resource of social service organizations that could be deliberately and actively linked, or networked, for

mutual support, representational, and/or explicit programmatic purposes. Conceivably, their views could be advanced with convincing authenticity and objectivity on social welfare and humanitarian issues, and perhaps in consequence their voices would be heard with less skepticism than those of other organizations whose agendas are perceived to be more explicitly political.

CHAP indisputably addresses humanitarian needs. It has impact in relieving human misery and in mitigating the socio-economic costs of transition borne by some individuals and by some institutions. The equation of need to response cannot be balanced, however, to conclude that sufficient resources are available through a program of this modest size to meet the totality of humanitarian needs in Ukraine or Moldova. The numbers of individuals, families, and service institutions requiring assistance are too large to assume that it is possible to meet all needs, even if all of the aid of all of the donors were committed to raising an effective social welfare safety net. In such a context, the dispersion of CHAP assistance via commodity distributions to individuals and institutions in every oblast and almost every raion of Ukraine can be seen to attenuate impact, bringing to mind the analogy of using a watering can to irrigate a 10-acre farm. Greater focusing of aid on a smaller number of effective NGOs, for example, would increase their effectiveness as well as their likely community impact.

CHAP provides a means to quickly channel aid to distressed populations affected by natural or man-made disasters. Container shipments with needed commodities are rapidly identified and diverted for use in emergency response efforts. In addition, Counterpart's local staff have proved to be adept in quickly identifying NGOs in disaster-affected areas which are able to serve as consignees and distribution partners for commodities. Of equal significance, these organizations play a critical role in identifying priority commodity requirements and focusing on the needs of individuals or the specific populations at greatest risk. Counterpart also has earned high praise from Ukrainian emergency response services for the initiative it took in 1997 to supply software and associated training to create a Geographic Information System (GIS) for the country. The digitized mapmaking and interpretation capabilities afforded by the GIS have substantially enhanced the ability of Ukrainian emergency services to respond preemptively as well as promptly to disasters, such as landslides and floods.

A missing element, however, in the assistance provided through CHAP is a planning structure that formally projects equipment and supply needs, as well as related training, that can serve as a matrix for identifying and supplying commodities over a period of time (*i.e.*, two years). Such a matrix would be most usefully developed not only with the Ministry of Emergencies, but also with other donors and international relief organizations whose contributions could be solicited.

**Conclusions:** The assessment team's analysis and observations of the CHAP initiative lead to the clear conclusion that solid and sustained contributions to USAID's strategic objectives in response to humanitarian needs are being made through the program. The most needy are being directly assisted and the victims of disasters are being helped in an effective manner. Local NGO distribution partners and recipient agencies are being bolstered through their engagement in CHAP. That said, it is imperative to keep in perspective the limitations of CHAP—limitations inherent in any commodities import program and in a program so limited in resources relative to need—and not to burden it with unrealistic expectations.



The built-in limitations of CHAP and the overwhelming humanitarian needs faced in the region argue strongly for precision in its strategic approaches to basic objectives. Here, the team believes, improvements can be made.

**Recommendations:** It is the recommendation of the team that adherence to a more limited definition of humanitarian assistance in the identification of commodities selected for distribution be followed. While it is not the team's intent to be prescriptive in this regard, consideration could be given, for example, to establishing stricter and more limited categories of commodities matched to specific uses as envisaged in each of CHAP's country programs. Such explicit listings of commodities could then be considered to be of the highest priority for agricultural workers; for medical care facilities, or for establishing national or regional response capabilities. In addition to providing a clearer definition of demand (versus incidental supply) for program planning and targeting, conceivably such an approach would offer potential efficiencies in the commodity screening process funded by USAID and Counterpart in the United States and Western Europe.

It is further recommended that a more focused and targeted approach be undertaken in the distribution of such goods. That is, it is believed that greater impact can be achieved by supplying a lesser number of recipients—or in some cases more recipients within the same locality—with more substantial contributions. In short, there needs to be more consolidation of where CHAP operates geographically.

The team also recommends that the local NGO institutional capacity building element of CHAP be bolstered and made more responsive to existing mission strategy in this regard. Finally, the team recommends that CHAP serve as a vehicle for the construction of matrices for more coordinated responses to disaster situations and the identification of basic contingency planning that would allow more effective response to disasters by governments, donor agencies and NGOs.

#### **IV. COUNTERPART'S IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAP**

**Does Counterpart's administration of CHAP successfully advance USAID humanitarian assistance strategies?**

**Discussion:** The basic organization of CHAP and Counterpart's management structure for its implementation is well-known to USAID and Department of State officials engaged in the provision of humanitarian assistance to the Western NIS and need not be detailed here. Appendix 6 provides an overview of Counterpart's engagement in CHAP.

The construction of CHAP is straight-forward: surplus commodities from the Department of Defense and other sources are identified by Counterpart representatives in the United States, Germany and elsewhere and Counterpart officials in the Western NIS explore the utilization of these commodities by various social services organizations—orphans, hospitals, homes for the elderly, farmers' unions, boarding schools and so on—engaged in humanitarian assistance and/or developmental activities. Once potential end users have indicated a need for and an ability to use

the available commodities—clothing, medical supplies and equipment, pharmaceuticals, beds, footwear, furniture and so on—Counterpart organizes the importation and forward transport of the goods.

Working through a series of distribution partners, Counterpart supervises the warehousing of the commodities pending final distribution to recipient agencies—who receive donations only upon agreeing to strict procedures in their usage (such as, no selling or bartering of materials, no discrimination in distribution, and the like). Illustrative of this tightly structured process, in several clinics and hospitals visited by team members there were public postings regarding the donation of pharmaceuticals by the people of the United States and a notice that such items were to be provided free of charge.

*"The most valuable benefit to our organization was the experience of working with other NGOs, particularly Counterpart because of its attitudes and business practices. Counterpart's project directors delivered on their promises...they were professional from beginning to end." -*

Director of Ukrainian NGO serving as CHAP Distribution Partner

At every step of the movement of the goods from arrival in-country (Moldova, Ukraine or Belarus) to distribution to recipient agencies, Counterpart *project managers* conduct a series of inspections and inventories of the commodities. Information from these inspections are fed on a daily basis into a comprehensive database that provides for precise tracking of all transfers of commodities from one location and one party to the next. The thoroughness and accuracy of the database—which is accessible from Counterpart offices in both Washington, D.C., and throughout the Western NIS—was demonstrated on several occasions and is deemed to be of superior design and utility by assessment team members.

Beyond the routine distribution of surplus commodities to social service entities, an additional role is played by Counterpart in response to the frequent disasters that plague the region. Counterpart is able, at USAID mission and American Embassy behest, to divert commodities from intended beneficiaries to the victims of those disasters. Due to the near constant stream of goods coming into the region through CHAP and Counterpart's expertise at meeting customs clearance requirements and at mastering transport logistics, U.S. Government disaster relief is often delivered to stricken sites only days after a disaster situation has been declared, providing a high profile demonstration of American concern and generosity. While the assessment team was in Ukraine (February and March, 2001), severe flooding devastated numerous communities in the Transcarpathian region. Within hours of notification of the disaster, Counterpart's deputy director pivoted from other responsibilities to oversee the response to the flooding and goods were quickly diverted to the region. Appendix 7 provides details of the relief assistance provided to flood victims through CHAP.

**Conclusions:** Team members fully credit Counterpart for a highly effective and efficient administration of CHAP. The transparency and accountability standards they have erected at all points of the distribution chain at the center of CHAP are genuinely impressive—and essential in a region where corruption and political or personal favoritism are rampant. The professionalism and dedication of the Counterpart staff—with rare exception—are immediately apparent and allow a lean operation that can quickly respond to both need and opportunity. The clarity of

Counterpart's communication with distribution partners and recipient agencies contributes to a high degree of utilization of the commodities provided. Their ability to comply with baffling and ever-changing rules, procedures, permit requirements and other hurdles erected by host government agencies more intent on control than facilitation is masterful. *The ability of Counterpart to provide near total transparency and tracking on the receipt and distribution of a fairly massive volume of humanitarian goods coming into the region is an invaluable element of CHAP that well serves USAID interests.*

Counterpart's management of CHAP is not perfect. Its personnel structure in Moldova is not as strong as that observed elsewhere. There are too many cases of the donation of commodities being supply-driven and of questionable value to the recipients. Counterpart has in the views of the team members cast its net too wide and would be well-served to have a more focused approach to its distribution scheme. (In Ukraine, Counterpart has distributed commodities to every oblast and virtually every raion. While the sentiment behind such an approach is admirable, in the view of the team more impact would be achieved by targeting the assistance to a reduced number of sites meeting some coherent criteria.)

One of the major problems plaguing CHAP is not of Counterpart's making, but one that nevertheless is reflected in the program's management. The artificial and completely unrealistic value ascribed to the commodities donated creates a series of problems (discussed elsewhere in this report) and has the potential to undermine the program's credibility in certain circumstances. Saying something doesn't make it so, and the reported cash values of the commodities are of little value in assessing the real and substantial contributions made by CHAP. Thus, Counterpart's claim to leverage in \$26 worth of resources for every \$1 of USAID budgetary support, while based on Department of Defense acquisition costs, cannot be said to reflect the true market value of these commodities. Nor do such claims take account of the taxpayer-borne costs of transporting the commodities, as the majority of such costs are paid out of a Department of State administered account with funds appropriated under the Freedom Support Act.

The shortcomings noted here are rooted in the design of CHAP rather than in Counterpart's implementation practices (a point expanded upon elsewhere in this report). The management of the program by Counterpart is in fact laudatory and serves to relieve USAID of incalculable administrative burdens that simply could not be borne by current mission staffing patterns.

**Recommendation:** It is a strong recommendation of the assessment team that Counterpart International be retained as the implementing manager of CHAP in the anticipated next phase of the program (with the expressed hope that the modifications in design identified in this report be incorporated). There are several critical alterations in the design and strategic approach of CHAP spelled out below for consideration as that phase is implemented. The changes required stem not from management issues, but conceptual ones, it is important to underscore. It is hard to argue that USAID could replace the expertise demonstrated by Counterpart in the management of CHAP (or a substitute humanitarian assistance initiative) without long and costly delays and disruptions in operations and there is no perceived requirement or rationale to alter the management in CHAP in order to achieve improvements in its design and impact.

## V. USAID SUPPORT AND PROMOTION OF CHAP

**Is there need for a stronger role by USAID in the overall promotion of CHAP and the protection of Counterpart International in its relationships with governmental ministries and agencies?**

**Discussion:** Counterpart International, as noted elsewhere in this report, has mastered the required compliance with governmental rules and regulations—often Byzantine in nature, defying even minimal comprehension by outsiders—at all levels in the implementation of CHAP. Thus, the steady stream of commodities coming into the region are routinely cleared through customs and granted the various approvals required for transportation to end destinations. To a significant extent, Counterpart has succeeded at having normal taxes and fees waived on the movement of these commodities based on their humanitarian nature. The organization deserves enormous credit for its expertise in this area.

There are, however, policy level questions surrounding CHAP that periodically require attention if not intervention by USAID and/or U.S. Embassy officials. Illustrative of this point, assessment team members discovered that until a few months ago at least some oblast administrators in Ukraine were attempting to levy taxes on the recipients of U.S. humanitarian assistance. That is, an elderly pensioner living on the margin of existence might be faced with a (presumably minute) tax bill as a consequence of accepting clothing provided through CHAP. A cold weather jacket secured through Department of Defense excess commodities with a nominal value of \$80 could result in the pensioner's taxable income (though it is hard to conceive of a person living on \$18-\$22 per month *having* a taxable income) going up by some calculated amount. Such a policy obviously would negate the value of the humanitarian contribution. Through a series of interventions and discussions organized by Counterpart and its distribution partners, the taxing of humanitarian contributions has been avoided in several oblasts, and there is some indication that recent legislation may have further reduced the risk of tax liability.

Other complications continue to hinder the effectiveness of CHAP. In Ukraine's Sumy oblast, while the tax assessors have discontinued the policy of taxing individual recipients of humanitarian assistance, they apparently share information on commodity distributions with pension fund administrators. Then, in certain cases, the pension administrators deduct the value of the donated goods from individuals' monthly pension allowance. This action, of course, effectively taxes the contribution made through CHAP.<sup>3</sup>

The discovery of this practice by assessment team members resulted in a candid discussion with the oblast's deputy governor, who expressed ignorance of and outrage over the practice being implemented by officials under his control. He clearly indicated to team members that the policy would be altered and that no longer would any pensioner have their benefits debited for accepting humanitarian aid. Hopefully, USAID officials can confirm the policy shift on this important policy issue and underscore the absolute unwillingness of the United States Government to accept such a practice that penalizes the needy recipients of its humanitarian

---

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the vast majority of commodities distributed through CHAP are delivered to institutions, not individuals, so the application of this policy actually affects few people.

assistance.

An event observed by team members in Moldova illustrates the sometimes uneven support of CHAP by USAID representatives. While present in Chisinau, team members witnessed what appeared to be *facilitation* of the exclusion of the regional director of CHAP from a meeting with the Governmental Commission on Humanitarian Assistance by the USAID control officer for CHAP in Moldova. The exclusion of the regional director was in direct contradiction of the assessment team's wishes and had no merits in terms of the discussion that took place with the chair of the Commission. More importantly, it signaled a lack of regard for the CHAP program by its own funding agency. The incident is apparently not the first of its kind. Stances such as those observed in Moldova serve only to undermine faith in an important component of U.S. assistance to the region. It is difficult to comprehend why a USAID staff member would be so unsupportive of a USAID programmatic initiative as appeared to be case in Chisinau.

Another area relevant to CHAP merits increased focus and input by USAID staff. Missions in Kyiv and Chisinau appear to be less than well informed on the activities of donor agencies and international NGOs in the humanitarian assistance and disaster relief sector. The team discovered through structured roundtable discussions in both Ukraine and Moldova that in fact such donors have considerable experience and that a number of lessons from their involvement have been learned. The European Union, for example, has an ongoing grants competition to assist Ukrainian NGOs active in the social services sector (through a democracy and governance approach) and is able to forge 30-to-40 partnerships via this grant mechanism on an annual basis. The British and Dutch governments have similar approaches. The theme of several donors appears to be that a long-term reliance on external assistance to meet humanitarian needs is unrealistic and unhealthy and that greater efforts have to be made to bolster local capacity; and, further, that capacity should be posited in NGOs to the extent possible.

The Chisinau session revealed a significant amount of concern over the accelerating breakdown of the family structure in Moldovan society and the rising institutionalization of children as a direct consequence. There was near consensus on the particular difficulties of working with government authorities in the country. One participant noted that humanitarian assistance in Moldova without a strict monitoring structure can be a negative for the country and that such monitoring is particularly objectionable to government officials intent more on control than facilitation. All participants in the Chisinau roundtable asserted that the percentage of the population correctly categorized as needy or vulnerable is increasing.

The roundtable discussions in Kyiv and Chisinau revealed a degree of donor activity in the humanitarian arena unexpected by the assessment team, given comments by USAID officials in both countries. They also revealed an apparent total lack of participation by USAID in information-sharing if not coordination efforts by engaged donor agencies and international NGOs at the level represented at the two sessions.

**Conclusions:** The relationship between USAID and Counterpart International in its role as implementor of CHAP is overwhelmingly a healthy and positive one, with good two-way communication observed by the assessment team members. There is mutual respect and admiration expressed between officials at all levels over the smooth functioning of CHAP. The

ability of Counterpart to pivot quickly in response to disasters is clearly an invaluable resource to USAID and the representation of American interests on humanitarian concerns throughout the region.

That relationship would be improved, however, by greater engagement of USAID officials at all levels on the policy dialogue that accompanies CHAP. Counterpart should expect active official USAID facilitation to articulate and enforce USAID policies in its daily relations with government agencies that effectively control CHAP operations through the granting or withholding of permits and approvals of transport and distribution plans and the like.

The team also wishes to underscore the point that greater impact in the humanitarian assistance area is at least potentially being lost due to lack of involvement by responsible USAID officers in keeping abreast of the activities of other donors. The limitations of CHAP itself to significantly alter the situation faced by literally tens of millions of needy people in the region are discussed elsewhere in the report, as is the need for greater concentration on building the capacity of indigenous NGOs. Opportunities to build on the efforts of others and to create more synergies in CHAP's approach are being lost because of USAID's lack of engagement. (Counterpart is clearly more engaged than USAID in this area, but not necessarily to the extent desirable. Further, it is USAID engagement that sends the needed signal about the importance of CHAP.) It was noted by the team that in both Ukraine and Moldova donor groups have ongoing if informal coordinating sessions that USAID staff members were neither involved in nor apparently aware of prior to the roundtable discussions.

It is recognized that donor coordination is often easier to talk about than to achieve and that its benefits can be overstated. However, in the context of a program as limited in size and scope as CHAP, such an effort can serve to maximize its impact.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended by the assessment team that USAID and Counterpart initiate periodic review sessions in which policy issues—such as that presented by the effective taxation of recipients of U.S. humanitarian assistance—be identified for resolution between senior USAID or embassy officials and host government ministers or senior agency administrators. Greater support for CHAP at the policy dialogue level is warranted.

It is further recommended that the day-to-day management of USAID/Counterpart relations in Moldova be reviewed by both Counterpart and USAID offices in Chisinau and Kyiv.

The team also recommends that USAID missions in Ukraine and Moldova explore low-cost and practical means of facilitating greater donor coordination in the humanitarian assistance sector that will serve to heighten the profile and broaden the impact of CHAP.

## **VI. SPECIAL ISSUES**

This section of the report provides focus on three particular issues that merit expanded discussion.

**Do the current commodity selection and commodity valuation practices optimally serve CHAP's objectives?**

**Discussion:** Counterpart International generally succeeds in matching commodity availability with the pre-identified needs of recipients. In some cases, Counterpart's screeners have found and suggested commodities that may not have been specifically identified but fall within broad categorizations of need. This would appear to have been the case in several cases already noted in this report: that of the fire truck supplied to the Chisinau airport and the seeds shipped for use in Moldova. In the former case, both Moldova and Ukraine have a continuing need for updated, replacement equipment, and the fire truck appears to fit within this broad category of requested assistance. In the latter case, seeds have been included in the list of items requested by the National Farmers Federation of Moldova, the largest distribution partner working with Counterpart in that country.

**Fire Truck:** Airport emergency operations staff told the team that the donated fire truck, a twin-engine, high capacity pumper, was accepted when offered to them because their 10- and 13-year old Soviet-era pump trucks had smaller pumping capacities and now required more frequent maintenance. Both of these trucks were in operating order at the time of the team's visit. Airport staff said that the airport had experienced few emergencies in the past dozen years that required use of their firefighting equipment.

The assessment team would agree that the U.S.-supplied fire truck does enhance the airport's emergency response capabilities and could even be deployed beyond the airport if required. However, it does not appear to meet an urgent or critical humanitarian need, and indeed on entry it became the subject of some bureaucratic buck passing from the Humanitarian Assistance Committee (HAC) to another official clearance group as an item of technical, rather than humanitarian, assistance, for importation purposes. But the team found in its meeting with the chairman of the HAC that disposition of the fire truck remained an issue of concern. Other discussions in Moldova raised similar issues relating to the truck's appropriateness as an item of humanitarian assistance.

The general issue of the valuation of donated commodities is also highlighted in the case of the airport fire truck. Although in good operating condition, the original Department of Defense acquisition price of \$644,408 for the 1980 fire truck represents a gross over-statement of the truck's value today. While federal regulations require that the acquisition value be stated in U.S. documentation related to such excess commodity donations, it would not appear necessary for this value to have been used in the publicity related to the truck, or why alternative values, including that of *No Market Value* or *Value Unknown*, cannot be utilized in the importation processing of such a commodity. The team was made aware of at least one other U.S. agency that has used a *Value Unknown* designation for donated military surplus commodities, and presumes that an effort could be made to work out an administrative solution with both U.S. and host country authorities to devise an acceptable formula for formal valuation of donated commodities.

**Seeds:** The six-ton shipment of vegetable seeds supplied by a private donor in the United States was found to be infested on arrival in Moldova, despite final inspection and clearance at the time

the container was shipped from the U.S. port. Amidst concern that the infestation posed a threat to agriculture in Moldova, a decision was made to burn, rather than fumigate, the entire seed shipment. During the same time the assessment team was in Chisinau, a USDA-dispatched team arrived in-country to supervise the testing of retained samples of the infested seeds to determine the nature, and possible source, of their infestation. Officials of the HAC have expressed concern, in some cases bordering on anger, at the detection of infested seeds to Moldova.

The Vice-Minister of Agriculture also noted in a conversation with the assessment team that the importation of vegetable seeds raised additional issues of their appropriateness to local growing conditions and the lack of farmer familiarity with the cultivation and yield characteristics of U.S. varieties. In contrast, the head of the National Farm Federation stated his view that the infestation of the seed shipment was simply an unfortunate incident. He said it was his intention to request additional seed shipments.

While the cases of the fire truck and the seed shipment represent relatively rare examples of such commodity selections, the team noted more common cases of questionable commodity uses, particularly in the case of unique fire-fighting gear, such as a specialized helmet and visor sets, that had been provided to youth clubs where they are deemed to be of only marginal utility.

**Conclusions:** The primary rationale for using scarce discretionary USAID funds to support a commodity distribution program has been to meet compelling and critical humanitarian assistance needs as defined within the social welfare parameters presented in SAA 3. Broader definitions of these needs may undercut the compelling nature of such a rationale, or as demonstrated in the support for agricultural reform in Moldova, provide complementary aid that affects people directly. However, without clarification and agreement between the implementing agency, USAID, and the host government upon the purposes of CHAP and the nature of the commodities it provides, there is some danger of the program becoming less cost-effective and more susceptible to political targeting. In consequence, significant discretionary judgment must be exercised by the implementing agency to avoid the introduction of commodities which are not critical in meeting human needs but can create confusion concerning the purposes of CHAP.

Associated with this concern is the continuing issue of providing a correct valuation for the aid (*i.e.*, the commodities) being provided through the program. While it would be difficult to devise some retroactive formula that would accurately value past commodity donations through CHAP, it remains demonstrably clear that the values presently shown for these commodities, at least as listed by DOD, are not market values. (See Appendix 5 for Counterpart International's budget summary of CHAP—an accounting which reflects DoD acquisition costs as the value of the donated commodities.)

**Recommendations:** The assessment team presents several recommendations in response to the issues raised here: 1.) USAID and Counterpart should revisit the definition of humanitarian assistance as a useful characterization of the aid provided through the CHAP project, with consideration given to separate categorization of items that may be used in conjunction with USAID development initiatives 2.) Criteria and/or screening procedures need to be established for extraordinary items, particularly large capital items, to avoid the pitfalls of opportunistic commodity captures 3.) Agricultural inputs, such as seeds, fertilizer, or pesticides should not be



included in CHAP commodity shipments or distribution planning, 4.) An effort should be made to determine formulae for establishing parallel market prices for CHAP-sponsored commodities at point-of-entry to host countries.

**Does the disaster response element of CHAP adequately address enhancement of host-country emergency response structures?**

**Discussion:** CHAP represents an effective and economical means for the U.S. Government to respond to disasters in the Ukraine and Moldova, especially as many of these are categorized as *low level emergencies* which do not attract major international attention. However, given the frequency of such disasters in the region and the significant potential for major environmental damage to ensue from them (as in the 1996 Kharkiv sewage crisis), there is an apparent lack of planning attuned specifically to building internal country response capacities, or formalizing disaster coordination procedures. Of particular concern, once individuals move on or assignments change, the personal contacts which induced and facilitated cooperation in the past may not be applicable for the next disaster.

The team found officials of the Ukrainian Ministry of Emergencies remarkably vague on how donor assistance had been or would be mobilized once a disaster was seen to be developing or had actually occurred. Similarly, while Ministry officials noted that much of their field equipment was approaching the end of its useful life, they failed to suggest any formal plan for replacing or upgrading the equipment other than to insist upon the need for continued foreign assistance. *Ad hoc* donor consultations carried out by the team offered little evidence of prior information sharing, or of initiatives by CHAP to achieve such formal cooperation.

**Conclusion:** CHAP works well with officials at the local level once an emergency situation has been recognized. But the cooperation is largely dependent on personal contacts, rather than institutionalized communications procedures. Similarly, equipment replacement or the supply of consumable items (such as disposable protective gear) appears to occur on an *ad hoc* basis.

**Recommendations:** The team offers two related recommendations in response to the conclusions reached in this area: 1.) USAID, Counterpart and the American Embassy should jointly seek other donor and Ministry of Emergencies cooperation in establishing standard procedures for notification of disasters and information sharing that will avoid duplication of efforts or signal the need for mutual assistance (*e.g.*, in developing complementary commodity donations, or facilitating shipment and clearance procedures); and 2.) Counterpart should initiate discussions with the Ministry of Emergencies aimed at developing a stockpiling and equipment needs list which could drive a 'demand', rather than 'supply', agenda for commodity shipments over a period of time (*e.g.*, two years).

**Does CHAP offer sufficient focus on strengthening the capacity of host-country non-governmental organizations to respond to humanitarian needs?**

**Discussion:** The majority of U.S. Government assistance provided through CHAP is directed to state-run organizations. During the past year, 79 percent of commodities (by value) went to state

organizations in Ukraine; in Moldova, 61 percent; and in Belarus, 63 percent. Although these percentages reflect the reality that social services continue to be primarily provided through state-run institutions charged with care of *vulnerable populations*, they also reflect the difficulty of reaching the neediest individuals and families within these Soviet-era categories of populations judged to be at need. Instead, mission preference and strategy calls for the development of independent NGOs which can more accurately target the neediest in their communities. *It should be noted, however, that the mission's most recent funding amendment to the CHAP agreement contains scope-of-work guidance which inevitably will require Counterpart to channel more, rather than less, CHAP funding to state-run or state-sponsored institutions by stipulating higher assistance rates to particular vulnerable groups.*

**Conclusions:** The availability of commodities as a chosen aid mechanism and the extant systems in the region for social services delivery favor distribution of CHAP assistance to state institutions as the most direct way available today to address humanitarian assistance needs. Yet the long-term interests of civil society and of those whose needs are defined by the means available to them, rather than their allocated social category, require a more strategic calculus to order the provision of U.S. aid.

**Recommendation:** USAID and Counterpart should undertake an intensive review of recipient organizations under the CHAP project concurrent with renewal of grant funding in order to identify the means of steadily increasing the percentage of humanitarian assistance being channeled through the emerging NGO sector. Raising the profile and increasing the capacity of NGOs should be seen as a priority goal of CHAP and that goal is best promoted by more effective engagement of NGOs as distribution partners and end-recipient agencies. In the view of the assessment team, the target engagement of NGOs in CHAP should be that ultimately more than 50 percent of the donated humanitarian assistance is channeled through these entities.

## VII. THE FUTURE OF CHAP

**Should USAID fund an extension of CHAP and if so, what modifications to the program's design and implementation should be considered?**

**Discussion:** The central point for USAID management in seeking an independent assessment of humanitarian needs in the Western NIS and an evaluation of Counterpart's implementation of the CHAP initiative was to obtain informed guidance as to whether or not the program should be extended for an additional phase and, if so, what modifications are warranted in design and implementation. Such judgment logically flows from the assessment team's examination of basic questions: is there a need for continued humanitarian assistance; is USAID strategy responsive to the need; and, is Counterpart's administration of CHAP advancing USAID goals and objectives through effective program management?

This report covers these core issues and provides the assessment team's findings in each area. In abbreviated fashion, the team's assessment is that further humanitarian assistance is justified, that modifications in strategy need to be implemented, and that Counterpart's administration of

CHAP is notably strong and should be continued. The team's work and this report additionally cover related specific topics that inform the guidance offered here on extending CHAP for an additional phase.

**Conclusions:** It is the team's finding that the term *humanitarian assistance* is too loosely constructed and defined in the CHAP context. The lack of definition affects the strategic design of CHAP and results in a program that encompasses genuine disaster/humanitarian assistance activities and other elements which are of a more general developmental nature. Thus the broad definition of humanitarian assistance utilized in CHAP may provide some room for maneuverability as the implementation of economic reforms stall in the region, but also results in dubious activities only marginally related to humanitarian need. It is, for example, hard to perceive commodity assistance to youth clubs for summer camps as humanitarian aid, although inputs may generally fall under the broad umbrella of the CHAP title (Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program). Similarly, aid to entrepreneurial farmers in Moldova (a most worthwhile goal as part of USAID's economic reform portfolio) does not easily fit into the same category as humanitarian aid for starving pensioners. While such a semantic distinction should not necessarily require exclusion of such aid from CHAP, it requires some explanatory stipulation which demonstrates its coherence with the project's declared purposes. Alternatively, the project's purposes could well benefit from re-articulation, particularly as these might be more realistically and strategically described.

The team finds that the program is too widely dispersed geographically to have the desired impact. By any relevant measurement, CHAP is not a large undertaking and it needs to be more concentrated if it is to have significant results.

The assessment team also finds that greater effort needs to be made via CHAP to strengthen the emerging NGO communities in the Western NIS countries. Due to obvious historical reasons, the preponderant share of the social services organizations with which CHAP is engaged in commodity distribution are state-affiliated entities. CHAP cannot be expected to alter that situation in any direct manner, but greater effort needs to be made to strengthen what NGO partners there are or that can be encouraged. At some point—*now* in the view of the assessment team—greater attention has to be paid to the sustainable impact of this effort and greater sustainability is more likely to be achieved through NGO strengthening than subsidization of state-affiliated enterprises. CHAP's past and present distribution partners present an obvious grouping of NGOs that should be encouraged to form networks and consortia that could take on expanded humanitarian assistance roles. Institutional capacity building inputs for such entities could, at reasonable cost levels, be built into the next phase of CHAP.

A related conclusion of the assessment team is that Counterpart—or any other U.S.-based implementor of the next phase of CHAP—needs to see as a priority programmatic objective the goal of working itself out of a job. That is, the implementor of the initiative should be tasked with facilitating the *indigenization* of the entire in-country operation of CHAP. Illustratively, Counterpart's existing staff in Kyiv clearly presents a model cadre of professionals who could plausibly implement CHAP or its successors through, creating a local NGO structure, or working through an established NGO.

The conclusions expressed here flow from and do not contradict the assessment team's fundamental finding that significant and genuine humanitarian needs exist in the Western NIS and that USAID should be engaged in responding to those needs. They are meant to sharpen the strategic approach of USAID and Counterpart in meeting those needs and to ensure greater impact of a sustainable nature in doing so.

**Recommendations:** It is the recommendation of the team that CHAP be funded for an additional three year period of time. It is further recommended that Counterpart International be slated as the administrator of the next phase of operations.

That said, the team strongly recommends that a central component of the grant between USAID and Counterpart for the next phase of CHAP be explicit in stating the expectation that Counterpart will develop a comprehensive *exit plan* from its current role as direct manager of CHAP activities in the region. A key element of that plan, among others, would be an approach to the indigenization of the management of the program. The exit plan should be agreed upon between USAID and Counterpart within six months of the commencement of the next phase of CHAP.

Further, the team recommends that USAID enhance the budget of CHAP—by a relatively small amount probably not in excess of \$100,000—to allow for NGO capacity building activities—training workshops and technical assistance, primarily, but also an annual NGO conference on humanitarian assistance topics—that will directly strengthen the ability of local non-governmental entities to be responsive to humanitarian needs in the region. Building local capacity to respond to disaster situations and other manifestations of humanitarian need should be central to the next phase of CHAP.

## VIII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation:** Humanitarian assistance remain a strong element within USAID programming in the Western NIS. And, as detailed elsewhere, it is recommended that steps be taken to sharpen the focus of humanitarian interventions to ensure enhanced impact in this sector.

**Recommendations:** Adherence to a more limited definition of humanitarian assistance in the identification of commodities selected for distribution be followed. While it is not the team's intent to be prescriptive in this regard, consideration could be given, for example, to establishing stricter and more limited categories of commodities matched to specific uses as envisaged in each of CHAP's country programs. Such explicit listings of commodities could then be considered to be of the highest priority for agricultural workers; for medical care facilities, or for establishing national or regional response capabilities. In addition to providing a clearer definition of demand (versus incidental supply) for program planning and targeting, conceivably such an approach would offer potential efficiencies in the commodity screening process funded by USAID and Counterpart in the United States and Western Europe.

It is further recommended that a more focused and targeted approach be undertaken in the distribution of such goods. That is, it is believed that greater impact can be achieved by supplying a lesser number of recipients—or in some cases more recipients within the same

in the Western NIS. And, as detailed elsewhere, it is recommended that steps be taken to sharpen the focus of humanitarian interventions to ensure enhanced impact in this sector.

**Recommendations:** Adherence to a more limited definition of humanitarian assistance in the identification of commodities selected for distribution be followed. While it is not the team's intent to be prescriptive in this regard, consideration could be given, for example, to establishing stricter and more limited categories of commodities matched to specific uses as envisaged in each of CHAP's country programs. Such explicit listings of commodities could then be considered to be of the highest priority for agricultural workers; for medical care facilities, or for establishing national or regional response capabilities. In addition to providing a clearer definition of demand (versus incidental supply) for program planning and targeting, conceivably such an approach would offer potential efficiencies in the commodity screening process funded by USAID and Counterpart in the United States and Western Europe.

It is further recommended that a more focused and targeted approach be undertaken in the distribution of such goods. That is, it is believed that greater impact can be achieved by supplying a lesser number of recipients—or in some cases more recipients within the same locality—with more substantial contributions. In short, there needs to be more consolidation of where CHAP operates geographically.

The team also recommends that the local NGO institutional capacity building element of CHAP be bolstered and made more responsive to existing mission strategy in this regard. Finally, the team recommends that CHAP serve as a vehicle for the construction of matrices for more coordinated responses to disaster situations and the identification of basic contingency planning that would allow more effective response to disasters by governments, donor agencies and NGOs.

**Recommendation:** Counterpart International should be retained as the implementing manager of CHAP in the anticipated next phase of the program (with the expressed hope that the modifications in design identified in this report be incorporated). There are several critical alterations in the design and strategic approach of CHAP spelled out below for consideration as that phase is implemented. The changes required stem not from management issues, but conceptual ones, it is important to underscore. It is hard to argue that USAID could replace the expertise demonstrated by Counterpart in the management of CHAP (or a substitute humanitarian assistance initiative) without long and costly delays and disruptions in operations and there is no perceived requirement or rationale to alter the management in CHAP in order to achieve improvements in its design and impact.

**Recommendations:** USAID and Counterpart initiate periodic review sessions in which policy issues—such as that presented by the effective taxation of recipients of U.S. humanitarian assistance—should be identified for resolution between senior USAID or embassy officials and host government ministers or senior agency administrators. Greater support for CHAP at the policy dialogue level is warranted.

It is further recommended that the day-to-day management of USAID/Counterpart relations in Moldova be reviewed by both Counterpart and USAID offices in Chisinau and Kyiv.

Counterpart and the American Embassy should jointly seek other donor and Ministry of Emergencies cooperation in establishing standard procedures for notification of disasters and information sharing that will avoid duplication of efforts or signal the need for mutual assistance (e.g., in developing complementary commodity donations, or facilitating shipment and clearance procedures); and 2.) Counterpart should initiate discussions with the Ministry of Emergencies aimed at developing a stockpiling and equipment needs list which could drive a *demand*, rather than *supply*, agenda for commodity shipments over a period of time (e.g., two years).

**Recommendation:** USAID and Counterpart should undertake an intensive review of recipient organizations under the CHAP project concurrent with renewal of grant funding in order to identify the means of steadily increasing the percentage of humanitarian assistance being channeled through the emerging NGO sector. Raising the profile of and increasing the capacity of NGOs should be seen as a priority goal of CHAP and that goal is best promoted by more effective engagement of NGOs as distribution partners and end-recipient agencies. In the view of the assessment team, the target engagement of NGOs in CHAP should be that ultimately more than 50 percent of the donated humanitarian assistance is channeled through these entities.

**Recommendations:** CHAP should be funded for an additional three year period of time. It is further recommended that Counterpart International be slated as the administrator of the next phase of operations.

That said, the team strongly recommends that a central component of the grant between USAID and Counterpart for the next phase of CHAP be explicit in stating the expectation that Counterpart will develop a comprehensive *exit plan* from its current role as direct manager of CHAP activities in the region. A key element of that plan, among others, would be an approach to the indigenization of the management of the program. The exit plan should be agreed upon between USAID and Counterpart within six months of the commencement of the next phase of CHAP.

Further, the team recommends that USAID enhance the budget of CHAP—by a relatively small amount probably not in excess of \$100,000—to allow for NGO capacity building activities—training workshops and technical assistance, primarily, but also an annual NGO conference on humanitarian assistance topics—that will directly strengthen the ability of local non-governmental entities to be responsive to humanitarian needs in the region. Building local capacity to respond to disaster situations and other manifestations of humanitarian need should be central to the next phase of CHAP.

## **APPENDIX 1: CONTACT LIST**

The following names form a partial listing of interviews/consultants undertaken by the assessment team. Several additional contacts are impossible due to translation and logistical complications. The team made numerous visits to private residents in Ukraine and Moldova to observe living conditions for particularly needy individuals; those families are not identified here.

### **UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

- ♦ Christopher Crowley, Mission Director  
USAID/Kyiv
- ♦ Bob Wallin, Officer-in-Charge  
Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Michael Korin, E&E/EEST/HRHA  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Paul Holmes, E&E/EEST/HRHA  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Mary Ann Micka, E&E/EEST/HRHA  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Kevin C. Rafferty, BHR/PVC/IPS  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Alexandria L. Panehal, Deputy Mission Director  
USAID/Kyiv
- ♦ Marilyn A. Schmidt, Director  
Office of Democracy and Social Transition  
USAID/Kyiv
- ♦ Randall Thompson  
USAID/ Kyiv
- ♦ Konstantin I. Yakubenko, NGO and Humanitarian Assistance Specialist  
USAID/Kyiv

- ♦ Pamela Mandel, Deputy Director  
Office of Democracy and Social Transition  
USAID/Kyiv
- ♦ Irina Gladun, Program Assistant  
USAID/Kyiv
- ♦ Tom Lofgren, Country Representative  
USAID/Chisinau  
Chisinau, Moldova
- ♦ Vasile Filatov, Project Management Specialist  
USAID/Chisinau  
Chisinau, Moldova

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

- ♦ Charles R. Hardesty, Director  
Humanitarian Assistance (S/NIS-C)  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ John D. Post, Deputy Director  
Humanitarian Assistance (S/NIS-C)  
Washington, D.C.

**COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC.**

- ♦ Lelei LeLaula, Vice President, Board of Directors  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Richard Drolet, Director of Material Operations  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Sergiy Zhgilov, Transportation Manager  
Washington, D.C.
- ♦ Brian R. Propp, General Director  
CHAP/Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova  
Kyiv, Ukraine



- ♦ Sergey Khomchenko , Deputy General Director  
CHAP/Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Irina Mykolayenko, Director for External Relations  
CHAP/Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Mykhailo Arkhanhelsky, Project Director  
CHAP/Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Leonid Roshka, Country Director  
Chisinau, Moldova

### **GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE**

- ♦ Anatoliy D. Koval, First Deputy Chief  
Committee for Humanitarian Assistance Coordination  
Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine
- ♦ Dr. Tatjana Iljinykh, Chief Expert  
Committee for Humanitarian Assistance Coordination  
Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine
- ♦ Vladimir M. Ivanov, Deputy Chairman  
Luhansk Regional State Administration  
Luhansk, Ukraine
- ♦ Sergey Naprasnikov, Deputy Head of Oblast Health Administration  
Luhansk, Ukraine
- ♦ Vladimir Turayev, Head of Oblast Social Protection Administration  
Luhansk, Ukraine
- ♦ Rubizhne A. Busenkov, Acting Mayor  
Rubizhne, Ukraine
- ♦ Yurity Artsev, Head of Rubizhne City Social Protection Administration  
Rubizhne, Ukraine

- ♦ Irina Bozhych, Head of Rubizhne Family and Youth Administration  
Rubizhne, Ukraine
- ♦ Lyudmyla Herohiyivna Hametska, People's Deputy  
Simferopol City Council  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Mykola Oleksandrovych Sokolov, Deputy Head  
Sumy Oblast State Administration and Head, Humanitarian Assistance Commission  
Sumy, Ukraine

### **GOVERNMENT OF MOLDOVA**

- ♦ Ivan Tkachenko, Minister  
Ministry of Public Health Services and Social Maintenance  
Autonomous Moldovan Republic of Transnistria  
Tirastel, Transnistria, Moldova
- ♦ Alexandru Padurari, Vice President  
Balti Judetean  
Balti, Moldova
- ♦ Loghin Gheorghii Selivestrovici, Director  
Municipal Ministry of Social Protection and Families  
Ternului, Moldova
- ♦ Alexandru Padurari, Vice President  
Balti Judets Council  
Balti, Moldova
- ♦ Aleksandr Georgievich Pedurau, Vice Mayor  
Belts, Moldova  
BELTS
- ♦ Lidia Gutsu, Chair  
Governmental Commission on Humanitarian Assistance and Vice Prime Minister  
Chisinau, Moldova

### **UKRAINIAN NGOs/SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS**

- ♦ Dmitriy A. Bashilashvili, Vice-Chairman/Programs Coordinator  
The Society of the Red Cross of Ukraine, Crimean Branch  
Simferopol, Ukraine

- ♦ Vasyl Pavlovych Pyankov, Head  
Simferopol Republican Shelter for Adolescents  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Taras Loginov, Chairman  
Compass Club Children/Youth Organization  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Lubov Gur'yeva, Director  
Center of Social Protection and Assistance Charitable Foundation  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Oleksandr Yakovych Khripun, Chief Doctor  
Yolochka Children's House  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Dr. Anatoliy Lukyanenko, Director  
Borodyanka Central Raion Hospital for Babyntsi Hospital (?)  
Babyntsi, Ukraine
- ♦ Lyudmyla O. Boiko, Director  
Dovira Trust Center  
Babyntsi, Ukraine
- ♦ Nicolay Markevich, President  
Sumy Oblast Charitable Fund/Blagovist  
Sumy, Ukraine
- ♦ M. Zenoviy Dmytrovych Vivcharyk, Director  
Ternopil Secondary Boarding School for Children with Polio and Cerebral Palsy  
Ternopil, Ukraine
- ♦ Vladimir I. Bauchkin, Chairman  
Society of Red Cross of Ukraine, Crimean Branch  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Hanna Matsipura, Head  
Ternopil Oblast Charity and Health Foundation  
Teropil, Ukraine
- ♦ Volodymyr A. Zabolotskih, Head  
Globus Intellectual Creativity Youth Club  
Simferopol, Ukraine

- ♦ Luiza Y. Lukash, Director  
Perevalne Secondary School  
Perevalne Village, Ukraine
- ♦ Sergey V. Sapozhnikov, Head  
Felicitas Sumy City Society of Support to Mentally Handicapped Children  
Sumy, Ukraine
- ♦ Vasiliy P. Grigoriev, Director  
Nadezhda Republican Shelter  
Simferopol, Ukraine
- ♦ Zarema I. Asanova, Head  
Raion First Aid Post  
Sary, Ukraine
- ♦ Dilyara D. Ismailova, Director  
Sary-Bash Secondary School  
Sary, Ukraine

#### **MOLDOVAN NGOs/SOCIAL SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS**

- ♦ Victor Iapascurta, Program Director  
Medical Foundation of Moldova and IPHD (?)  
Chisinau, Moldova
- ♦ Vasile Mirzenco, Chairman  
National Farmers Federation of Moldova  
Chisinau, Moldova
- ♦ Palaghet Batrynac, Chief Doctor  
Family Medical Center of Basaraheasca Raion  
Basarabasca Raiou, Moldova
- ♦ Vasiliy Tabyrtsa, Director  
Psychoneurological Boarding House  
Brynzen, Moldova
- ♦ Anatolie Gutsan, Chairman  
Gutsu Peasant Farm  
Hineauts, Moldova
- ♦ Luchia L. Croytor, Director  
Foundation for Social Protection of Population of Belts  
Belts, Moldova

- ♦ Grigote Danu, Chairman  
Danu Grigore Peasant Farm
- ♦ Boris V. Guts, Director  
Auxiliary Boarding School of Chadyr-Lunga  
Chiadyr-Luna, Moldova
- ♦ Alexei Guritsenko, Director  
Asylum for Veterans and Invalids  
Cochyer, Moldova
- ♦ George Selivestrovich Login, Director  
Psychoneurological Boarding House  
Cochyer, Moldova
- ♦ Nadezhda I. Kirikoi, Head  
Hospital of Grigoriopol  
Grigoriopol Raion, Moldova
- ♦ George Simeon, Chairman  
Movement for Protection of Children and Vulnerable People of Gaganz  
Chiadyr-Lunga, Moldova

#### **INTERNATIONAL DONOR ASSISTANCE COMMUNITY**

- ♦ Anja Nitzsche, Political Affairs Officer,  
Delegation of the European Union Commission  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Sergey Prezhebelsky, Red Cross and Red Crescent Society  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Sabina Feierkopf, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Andreas Graf, Embassy of Switzerland  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Eric Sanson, First Secretary  
Embassy of France  
Kyiv, Ukraine
- ♦ Oksana Leschenko, Environmental Issues Consultant,  
United Nations Development Programme  
Kyiv, Ukraine

- ♦ Serge Oumow, Deputy Head of Office  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation  
Chisinau, Moldova
- ♦ Christopher Logan, Director  
The European Children's Trust  
Chisinau, Moldova
- ♦ Natalia Chumachenko, Translator  
Moldovan Accounting Reform Project  
Chisinau, Moldova

**APPENDIX 2: ASSESSMENT TEAM ITINERARY**

**Final Itinerary**  
**for the Evaluation Team's Visit to Ukraine and Moldova (February 23 - March 24, 2001)**

**Ukraine, February 23 - March 9**

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
<b>23-Feb-01</b>	<b>Fri</b>	13:30	Boryspil Airport	Arrival in Kyiv, Ukraine	Distance from Boryspil to Kyiv - 34 km
		14:15	Khreschatyk Hotel	Hotel check-in	Address: 14 Khreschatyk Street, tel [380] (44) 229-7339, 229-7193, fax 229-8544
		17:00	USAID/Kyiv	Meeting at USAID with Mr. Christopher Crowley, Mission Director, Ms. Alexandria Panehal, Deputy Director, Ms. Marilyn Schmidt, Director ODST, Ms. Pamela Mandel, Deputy Director, ODST, Mr. Konstantin Yakubenko, Ms. Irina Gladun, and Ms. Stella Rudenko	Address: 19 Nyzhniy Val Street, tel [380] (44) 462-5678, fax 462-5834
<b>24-Feb-01</b>	<b>Sat</b>	10:00-11:00	CHAP Office	Itinerary review	Address: 26 Lesya Ukrainka Boulevard, tel [380] (44) 230-2346
		11:00-13:00	CHAP Office	CHAP/WESTNIS presentation. Questions and answers	
		13:00-14:00	CHAP Office	Lunch	
		14:00-18:00	CHAP Office	CHAP database presentation. Questions and answers	
<b>25-Feb-01</b>	<b>Sun</b>	Whole Day	Downtown Kyiv	Day off	
<b>26-Feb-01</b>	<b>Mon</b>	9:30-10:30	CHAP Office	Introduction meeting in CHAP Office	Address: 26 Lesya Ukrainka Boulevard, tel [380] (44) 230-2346
		11:00-12:00	CHAP Office	Introduction to CHAP file system	
		12:00-12:15		Drive to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, Humanitarian Assistance Commission	
		12:15-13:00	The Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, Humanitarian Assistance Commission	Meeting with Mr. Anatoly Koval, Deputy Head, Humanitarian Assistance Commission attached to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and Ms. Tatiana Ilyinykh, Responsible Secretary of the Commission	Address: 12/22 Grushevskoho Street, tel [380] (44) 293-4405

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		13:00-14:00	Da Vinci Restaurant	Business lunch with Mr. Anatoly Koval, Deputy Head, Humanitarian Assistance Commission attached to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and Ms. Tatiana Illyinykh, Responsible Secretary of the Commission	
		14:00-14:30		Drive to Compass Club Youth Organization	
		14:30-16:30	Kyiv City	Visit to Compass Club, Head Taras Loginov	Address: 15 Tichyny Street, tel [380] (44) 553-7857
<b>27-Feb-01</b>	<b>Tue</b>	9:00-10:30		Drive to Babyntsi Town, Kyiv Oblast	Distance to Babyntsi - 56 km
		10:30-12:30	Babyntsi Hospital	Visit to Babyntsi Hospital, meeting with Chief Doctor Anatoliy T. Lukyanenko	Town of Babyntsi, 5 Kalinina Street, tel [380] (44) 775-2343, 777-1249
		12:30-13:00		Drive to Dovirya (Trust) Center for Psychological Rehabilitation of the Population, Borodyanka, Kyiv Oblast	Distance to Borodyanka - 14 km
		13:00-14:30	Town of Borodyanka	Meeting with Director of the Dovirya (Trust) Center for Psychological Rehabilitation of the Population Lyudmyla O. Boiko	Town of Borodyanka, 228 Lenin Street, tel [380] (44) 775-2002, 775-3050, 775-1487
		14:30-15:30		Drive to Kyiv	Borodyanka - Kyiv - 70 km
		16:00-17:30	USAID/Kyiv	Round-table meeting with donors: Jeffrey Clark, David Rhoad, Brian Propp, Sergey Khomchenko, Konstantin Yakubenko	19 Nyzhniy Val Street, tel [380] (44) 462-5678, fax 462-5834
<b>28-Feb-01</b>	<b>Wed</b>	Morning	Dnipro Hotel	Hotel check-out	
		10:15	Dnipro Hotel	Trip to Zhuliany Airport	
		11:40	Zhuliany Airport	Leaving for Simferopol. Flight OP 3366, arriving in Simferopol at 13:40 (ticket \$89 per person)	Distance from Kyiv to Simferopol: 852 km
		13:40	Airport	Arrival in Simferopol	
		13:40-14:30	Simferopol	Trip from airport to Volga Hotel	



Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		14:30-15:00	Volga Hotel, Simferopol	Hotel check-in	Hotel address: 2 Lavandovy Lane, tel [380] (65) 252-1225 (administrator) or 251-5837(director)
		15:00-18:00	Simferopol	Presentation of Crimea Project and Distribution Partner, Social Protection and Help Center Charitable Foundation, Chairwoman Lyubov I. Gur'eva	24 Vorovskoho Street, Simferopol, tel [380] (65) 225-9720, 227-0235, fax 225-3168
<b>1-Mar-01</b>	<b>Thu</b>	<b>Group #1</b>	David Rhoad, Brian Propp, and Iryna Mykolayenko		
		09:00-11:00	Village of Urozhayne	Urozhayne Secondary School of Urozhayne Village, Director Mayra D. Salidinova	Distance from Simferopol to Urozhayne - 26 km, contact tel. [380] (65) 236-2316, 236-2240
		11:00-13:00	City of Simferopol	Vinni-Pukh (Vinnie the Pooh) Children Kindergarten #83, Head Olha T. Dodohova	The distance from Village of Urozhayne to Vinnie the Pooh Kindergarten - 33 km, address: 2/89 Henerala Zaharova Street, Simferopol, tel [380] (65) 227-5406, 227-8544
		14:00-15:30	City of Simferopol	Deliveriing wheelchair to invalid Levchenko, Lora Tomasivna	Distance - 21 km, address: Apartment 142, 89 Balaklavskaya Street, Simferopol
		16:00-18:00	City of Simferopol	Visit to Globus Intellectual Creativity Youth Club, Head Volodymyr A. Zabolotskih (located at Simferopol Secondary School #12, Director Lyudmila G. Gametskaya)	Distance - 15 km, address: 7 Blyukhera Street, tel [380] (65) 227-2205
		<b>Group #2</b>	Jeffrey Clark, Sergey Khomchenko, and Kostya Yakubenko		
		09:00-11:00	City of Simferopol	Visit to Yolochka (Spruce Tree) Republican Children's House, Director Aleksandr Y. Khripunov	Distance 13 km, address: 4 Aralska Street, tel [380] (65) 244-0364, 244-0522
		11:00-12:00	Perevalne Village	Visit to Perevalne Secondary School, Director Luiza Y. Lukash	Distance 38 km, address: 85 Dachna Street, tel [380] (65) 222-7071, 261-3280

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		12:00-13:00	Baranovka Village of Simferopolsky Raion	Visiting the families of Pasechnik (a widow with four children Elena Pasechnik), Smirnovs (two children, unemployed parents), and Nikitins (grandparents)	Distance - 3 km
		13:00-14:00	Simferopolsky Raion	Lunch, Kosatsky Shlyakh (Kossak's Way) Restaurant	Distance - 7 km
		14:00-15:00	City of Simferopol	Visit to Nadezhda (Hope) Republican Shelter, Director Vasily P. Grigoriev	Distance - 51 km, address: 18 Zoyi Zhytsovoi Street, tel [380] (65) 224-1398, 224-1469
		15:00-16:30	Stroganovka Village of Simferopol Raion	Visiting the family of Abdurakhmanovs (Crimean Tatars)	Distance - 10 km
		16:30-18:00	Denisovka Village of Simferopol Raion	Visiting the family of Ismailovs (Crimean Tatars)	Distance - 8 km
<b>2-Mar-01</b>	<b>Fri</b>				
		09:00-11:00		Drive to Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	87 km from Simferopol
			Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	Visits to Tatars village that have not received assistance from CHAP	Contact person Vladimir I. Bauchkin, Chairman, Crimean Branch of the Society of Red Cross of Ukraine, [380] (65) 227-2613, 227-8894
		11:00-11:30	Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	Visiting Raion First-Aid Post, Head Zarema I. Asanova	
		11:30-12:00	Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	Visit to the family of Islambekovs (six children)	
		12:00-12:30	Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	Visit to Gulnar B. Belyalova (single unemployed mother, seriously ill child)	
		12:30-13:30	Sary-Bash, Pervomaysky raion, Crimea	Visit to Sary-Bash Secondary School, Director Dilyara D. Ismailova	
		13:30-15:30		Drive to Simferopol	Distance - 87 km
		16:30-17:00	Simferopol	Drive to hotel	
		18:48	Simferopol	Hotel check-out. Departure for Donetsk	Train #48, arriving in Donetsk at 6 25, the distance from Simferopol to Donetsk - 571 km
<b>3-Mar-01</b>	<b>Sat</b>	6 25		Arrival in Donetsk	

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		06:40-10:00		Drive from Donetsk to Luhansk	Distance from Donetsk to Luhansk - 160 km
		10:00-10:40	Luhansk, Druzhba (Friendship) Hotel	Hotel check-in	Address 16 A Pavla Soroky Street, tel [380] (64) 253-5353 (administrator)
		11:40-11:50		Drive to Luhansk Oblast State Administration	
		11:50-13:00	Luhansk Oblast State Administration	Meeting with Deputy Chairman of Luhansk Oblast State Administration, Mr. Vladimir M. Ivanov, and Sergey Naprasnikov, Deputy Head of Oblast Health Administration, Vladimir Turayev, Head of Oblast Social Protection Administration	tel. [380] (64) 252-3095, 252-5334, address: 3 Heroyiv Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voyny Square, Luhansk
		13:00-14:00		Drive to Krasnodon	Distance from Luhansk to Krasnodon - 60 km
		<b>Group #1</b>	David Rhoad, Sergey Khomchenko, and Andriy Styopkin		
		14:00-15:30	Town of Krasnodon	Visit to the family of Krakatytsya Petro Ivanovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 19A/12 Lenin Street, Town of Krasnodon
		15:40-16:40	Town of Krasnodon	Visit to the family of Horokhov Oleksandr Serhiyovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 5/163 Lisovy District, Town of Krasnodon
		16:50-17:30	Town of Krasnodon	Relatives/dependants of Ostapchuk Volodymyr Petrovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 1/57 Lyutykov Street, Town of Krasnodon
		<b>Group #2</b>	Jeffrey Clark, Brian Propp, and Iryna Mykolayenko		
		14:00-15:00	Town of Krasnodon	Visit to the family of Levitsky Yuri Oleksiyovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 5 Rozsypin Street, Town of Krasnodon
		15:00-16:30	Town of Krasnodon	Visit to the family of Borodin Serhiy Volodymyrovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 17 Richna Street, Town of Krasnodon
		16:30-18:00	Town of Krasnodon	Visit to the family of Horbachevsky Oleksiy Mykolayovych (Barakov mine disaster victim, dead)	Address: 14/3 Nahorny Lane, Town of Krasnodon
		18:00-19:00		Drive to Luhansk	60 km

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
4-Mar-01	Sun			Day off	
5-Mar-01	Mon				
		08:00-10:00		Drive to Rubizhne	Distance from Luhansk to Rubizhne - 120 km
		10:00-11:10	Town of Rubizhne, Rubizhne Raion State Administration	Meeting with representatives from Rubizhne Raion State Administration and members of Rubizhne Women's Council (distribution partner), Acting Mayor of Rubizhne A. Busenkov, tel. [380] (64) 537-6977, 537-4143, Yuriy Artsev, Head of Rubizhne City Social Protection Administration, Irina Bozhych, Head of Rubizhne Family and Youth Administration	Address: 2 Lenina Square, Rubizhne
		<b>Group #1</b>		Brian Propp, David Rhoad, and Iryna Mykolayenko	
		11:10-11:20		Drive to Rubizhne Territorial Center for Social Services to Pensioners and Single and Disabled People	
		11:20-12:00	City of Rubizhne	Visit to Territorial Center of Social Service to Pensioners and Single Disabled People, Town of Rubizhne, Director Tetyana V. Skrypychenko (Head of the Women's Council of Rubizhne)	Address: 7 Rudenko Street, Rubizhne, tel [380] (64) 537-4038, 537-4143
		12:00-12:10		Drive to Kreminna Town	Distance from Rubizhne to Kreminna Town - 20 km
		12:10-13:00	Town of Kreminna	Visit to Kreminna Territorial Center for Social Services	
		14:00-14:10		Drive to Edelweis (Edelweiss) Society of Invalids of Rubizhne City	
		14:10-15:00	City of Rubizhne	Visit to Edelweis (Edelweiss) Society of Invalids of Rubizhne City, Chairwoman Olena Derdik	Address: 49 Lenin Street, tel [380] (64) 227-1432
		15:00	City of Rubizhne	Groups meet together at the office of Edelweis (Edelweiss) Society of Invalids of Rubizhne City	
		<b>Group #2</b>		Jeffrey Clark, Sergey Khomchenko, and Andriy Styopkin	
		11:10-11:20		Drive to Rubizhne Territorial Medical Amalgamaton	
		11:20-12:00	City of Rubizhne	Visit to Rubizhne Territorial Medical Amalgamaton, Chief Doctor Vyacheslav A. Rutkovsky	Address: 19 Studentska Street, tel [380] 535-0400, 535-2421
		12:00-12:10	City of Rubizhne	Drive to Promin Children Invalid Society of Rubizhne City	

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		12:10-13:00	City of Rubizhne	Visit to Promin Children Invalid Society of Rubizhne City, Head Olga Petrenko	Address: 88 Pershotravneva Street, Rubizhne, tel [380] (64) 535-5720, 535-2918
		14:00-14:10	City of Rubizhne	Drive to Rostok (Sprout) Rubizhne City Large Families Association	
		14:10-15:00	City of Rubizhne	Visit to Rostok (Sprout) Rubizhne City Large Families Association, Head Lyudmyla M. Zinchenko	Address: 30 Rokiv Peremohy (30 years of Victory) Street, Rubizhne, tel [380] (64) 537-1623
		15:00	City of Rubizhne	Groups meet together at Edelweis (Edelweiss) Society of Invalids of Rubizhne City	
		15:10-17:00		Drive to Luhansk	Distance 120 km
<b>Jeffrey Clark, Brian Propp, and Sergey Khomchenko</b>					
		17:30-17:50	Luhansk, Druzhba (Friendship) Hotel	Check-out from the hotel	
		17:55-18:10	Luhansk	Drive to the railway station	
		18:29		Train to Sumy	Train #606, from Luhansk, arriving in Sumy at 11:25, distance from Luhansk to Sumy - 535 km
<b>6-Mar-01</b>	<b>Tue</b>	11:25	City of Sumy	Arrival in Sumy	
		11:25 - 12:30	Sumy City, Khimik Hotel	Hotel check-in	Distance - 3 km, hotel Address: 14 Psilska Street, tel (54) 222-4500
		14:00-14:10	City of Sumy	Drive to Blagovist (The Annunciation) Sumy Oblast Charitable Foundation	Distance - 4 km
		14:10-15:30	City of Sumy	Meeting at Blagovist (The Annunciation) Sumy Oblast Charitable Foundation, Head Mykola K. Markevych	Address: 4 Kharkivska Street, tel [380] 233-1173, 232-2726
		15:30-15:45	City of Sumy	Drive to Felicitas Sumy City Society of Support to Mentally Handicapped Children	Distance - 5 km, address: 4 Frunze St., Suite 19, tel [380] (54) 233-5479, 221-1158
		15:45-16:45	City of Sumy	Meeting at Felicitas Sumy City Society of Support to Mentally Handicapped Children, Head Sergey V. Sapozhnikov	Contact tel [380] (54) 221-1158

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		16:45-17:00	City of Sumy	Drive to Blagovist (The Annunciation) Sumy Oblast Charitable Foundation	Distance - 5 km
		17:00-18:00	City of Sumy	Meeting at the Blagovist (The Annunciation) Sumy Oblast Charitable Foundation	
		18:00	City of Sumy	Drive to Khimik Hotel	
<b>7-Mar-01</b>	<b>Wed</b>				
		8:00 - 9:00	Sumy Oblast State Administration	Meeting with Mykola Oleksandrovych Sokolov, Deputy Head of Sumy Oblast State Administration (Head of Humanitarian Assistance Commission)	
		9:00 - 11:30		Drive to Shalyhyne Special Secondary Auxiliary Boarding School for Children with Mental Retardation	Distance- 170 km
		11:30-13:00	Town of Shalyhyne	Visit to Shalyhyne Special Secondary Auxiliary Boarding School for Children with Mental Retardation, Director Tamara P. Slukina	Contact tel [380] (54) 449-4214, 449-4254
		13:00-14:00	Town of Shalyhyne	Visiting a large family (single father with six children)	
		14:00-15:00	Town of Hlukhiv	Visiting a branch of the Hlukhiv Central Raion Hospital	
		16:00-18:00		Drive to Sumy	
		20:25 - 20:40	Sumy	Hotel check-out and drive to the railway station	
		21:15		Departure to Kyiv	Train #607, arriving in Kyiv at 5:04, the distance from Sumy to Kyiv - 339 km
<b>David Rhoad and Iryna Mykolayenko</b>					
<b>6-Mar-01</b>	<b>Tue</b>	7:30		Leaving Luhansk for Kyiv, arriving in Kyiv at 9:30 (ticket hr 433 for Ukrainians, hr 553 for foreigners)	Flight # 70 3565, the distance from Luhansk to Kyiv - 526 km
		9:30		Arriving in Kyiv, Zhebrany	
<b>David Rhoad, Iryna Mykolayenko, and Iryna Gladun</b>					
		18:45		Leaving for Lviv, arriving in Lviv at 20:15 (ticket hr 313 for Ukrainians, 5101 for foreigners)	Flight # 61 405, the distance from Kyiv to Lviv - 544 km
		20:15		Arriving in Lviv, hotel check-in	Hotel Zamok Leva (The Lion's Castle) tel (32) 235-1102

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
7-Mar-01	Wed				
		7:30 - 10:00		Pick up by car from Ternopil Oblast Charity and Health Foundation (distribution partner) and drive to Ternopil	Distance from L'viv to Ternopil - 127 km
		10:00 - 10:30	Ternopil Hotel	Arriving in Ternopil, hotel check-in	Hotel Ternopil, 14 Zamkova Street, tel. (35) 222-4397
		10:30 - 10:40		Trip to the Village of Petryky	
		10:40 - 12:40	The Village of Petryky	Meeting at Petryky Geriatric Boarding House	tel. (35) 233-2035/4054, Director Mr. Stepan Vasylyovych Hlushok
		12:40 - 12:50		Trip to Ternopil Experimental Prosthetic and Orthopedic Enterprise	
		12:50 - 14:30	City of Ternopil	Meeting with Director of Ternopil Experimental Prosthetic and Orthopedic Enterprise	10 Trolleybusna Street, tel. (35) 233-4903, Director Mr. Fedir Ivanovych Zayats
		15:50 - 16:50	City of Ternopil	Trip to and meeting at Ternopil Secondary Boarding School for Children with Consequences of Polio and Cerebral Palsy	6 Braty Boychuky (Boychuk Brothers) Street, tel. (35) 228-5500, Director M. Zenoviy Dmytrovych Vivcharyk
		19:50 - 20:50	City of Ternopil	Trip to and meeting at Ternopil Oblast Charity and Health Foundation, Distribution Partner for Ternopil Project	5A Horbachevsky Street, tel (35) 222-9369, Coordinator: Ms. Hanna M. Matsipura
		20:50 - 21:50	City of Ternopil	Trip to hotel	
		22:50 - 23:00	City of Ternopil	Hotel check-out	
		23:00		Drive to the railway station	
		23:57		Leaving for Kyiv	Train #50, arriving in Kyiv at 9.00, distance from Ternopil to Kyiv - 465 km

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
8-Mar-01	Thu	5:04 - Mr Clark 9:00 - Mr Rhoad		Arrival in Kyiv, Ukraine	Holiday in WESTNIS International Women's Day
9-Mar-01	Fri	12:30-13:10 13:40	Dnipro Hotel	Hotel check-out, drive to the railway station Departure to Kishinau	Train #47, Moscow-Kishinau, arriving in Kishinau at 5:20



## Moldova, March 10-15

10-Mar-01	Sat				
		5:25		Arrival in Kishinau, Moldova	
		5:25-5:40		Drive from railway station to hotel	
		9:40-9:50		Drive from hotel to USAID	
		10:00-11:30		Meeting at USAID	
		11:30-11:40		Drive from USAID to hotel	
11-Mar-01	Sun	12:00-13:30		Meeting at the National Farmers Federation of Moldova, Chairman Vasile Myrzenko	Address: Stefan Cel Mare Avenue, Chishinau, tel [373] 224-8165, 223-2236
12-Mar-01	Mon			Trip to the North of Moldova	
		7:00-9:00		Drive to the north of Moldova	Driver Aleksandr V Baklanov, cellular phone [373] 918-3508, Interpreter Natalia Chumachenko, cellular phone [373] 950-7794
		9:00	Town of Belts	Meeting with the Vice Mayor of Belts, Aleksandr Georgievich Peduraru	tel [373] 312-4033, address: 1 Independence Street, City of Belts
		10:00	Village of Brynzen	Visit to Psychoneurological Boarding House, Director Vasilii Tabyrtsa	Tel [373] 465-9340
		11:30	Village of Hincauts	Visit to Gutsu Anatolie Peasant Farm, Chairman Anatolie Gutsan	Tel [373] 467-6362, 467-6372, 462-4170
		13:30		Drive to Belts	
		14:30	Town of Belts	Meeting with distribution partner for the Northern Moldova Project, Foundation for Social Protection of Population of Belts, Director Luchia L. Croytor	tel [373] 312-2523, 312-9243, fax 312-1405
		16:00		Leaving for Chishinau	
		18:00	Chishinau	Arriving in Chishinau	Distance covered - 510 km



Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
				Trip to the South of Moldova	
		7:00-7:25		Drive to Danu Grigore Peasant Farm	Driver Andrey Krivosheenko, cel. [373] 917-2053, Interpreter Tatyana Fesina
		7:25-8:25	Chishinau Municipality	Visit to Danu Grigore Peasant Farm	52 Donich Street, Town of Durlesht, tel. [373] 272-3903, Chairman Grigore Danu
		8:25-10:25	Basarabeasca Raion	Drive to Family Medical Center of Basarabeasca Raion	
		10:25-12:00	Basarabeasca Raion	Visit to Family Medical Center of Basarabeasca Raion	tel [373] 672-2437, Chief Doctor Palaghea Batrynac
		13:40-15:00	Chiadyr-Lunga	Visit to Auxiliary Boarding School of Chadyr-Lunga	Address: 3 Lenin Street, tel [373] 612-3996, 612-4008, Director Boris V. Guts
		15:15-16:30	Chiadyr-Lunga	Movement for Protection of Children and Vulnerable People of Gagauz, Chairman Mr. George Simeon Chicadua	Address: Apartment 26, 4 Telman Street, Town of Chadyr-Lunga, [373] 612-3767, 612-3826
		16:30-18:50		Driving to Chishinau	
		18:50	Chishinau	Arriving in Chishinau	
<b>13-Mar-01</b>	<b>Tue</b>				
		8:00-9:00		Driving from Chishinau to Dubasary	
		9:00-9:15	Territorial Entity on the Left of Dnister (TransDnistria)	Checking through Transdnistrian customs	
		9:15-9:25	TransDnistria, Dubasar Raion	Driving to Cochyer	
		9:25-10:25	TransDnistria, Dubasar Raion, Village of Cochyer	Visit to Asylum for Veterans and Invalids, Mr. Alexei Guritsenko, Director, Mrs. Raisa Chebotari, Doctor, Mrs. Zinaida Cheban, Chief Nurse	Tel [373] 485-2480; [373] 485-2580
		9:25-10:25	TransDnistria, Dubasar Raion, Village of Cochyer	Psychoneurological Boarding House, Director George Selivestrovich Login	
		10:25-10:55		Driving from Cochyer to Grigoriopol	

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		10:55-11:45	TransDnistria, Grigoriopol Raion	Visiting a hospital in Grigoriopol, Head Nadezhda I. Kirikoi	Tel [373] 402-2448
		10:55-11:45		Visiting the family of Motyngas	Large family with five children
		11:45-12:30		Drive from Grigoriopol to Tiraspol	
		13:30-14:00	Tiraspol Municipality	Drive to an orphanage and family boarding house	
		14:00-14:45	Tiraspol Municipality	Visiting family type boarding house	Visit to Caramans family (three own children, five children adopted from an orphanage, met with Lyubov Caraman, tel [373] 333-4280
		14:45-15:00		Drive to the Ministry of Health	
		15:00-16:45	Tiraspol Municipality	Meeting at the Ministry of Health, Minister of Health and Social Protection of Transnistria, Mr. Ivan Valerievich Tkachenko, Member of the Humanitarian Assistance Commission in Chishinau, Chairman of the Humanitarian Assistance Commission in Transnistria; meeting with Minister of Education of Transnistria Mrs. Elena Bymeshko	Tel/fax [373] 332-2229
		16:00-17:00		Drive to Chishinau	
<b>14-Mar-01</b>	<b>Wed</b>	7:30-7:45	Chishinau	Drive from hotel to the Government of Moldova	
		8:00-9:00	Chishinau	Meeting with representatives of the Humanitarian Assistance Commission	Chairwoman Mrs. Lidia Gutsu, Secretary Mr. Ion Rabacu, Member of the Commission, tel [373] 223-3251, Deputy Minister of Health Mr. Ozea Rusu, tel [373] 272-9907
		10:00-11:25	Chishinau	USAID, round-table meeting with foreign donors	Medical Foundation of Moldova, Programs, Director Victor Iapatsurta; The European Children's Trust, Christofer A. Logan, Director ECT Moldova, tel [373] 223-8015; Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Serge Oumow, Deputy Head of Office, tel [373] 223-4389; First Secretary of the Romanian Embassy in Moldova Mr. Ion Negescu, tel [373] 221-3037
		11:30-11:40	Chishinau	Drive to Ukrainian Embassy	
		11:40-12:10	Chishinau	Getting Ukrainian visas	
		12:10-12:50		Drive to Cricova	
		13:00-15:00		Cricova	
		15:00-15:30	Chishinau	Drive to Chishinau Airport	

Date	Day	Time	Place	Major Events	Comments
		15:30-16:15	Chishinau	Chishinau Airport	Kishinau International Airport State Enterprise, General Director Valeriy Makar, tel [373] 252-6060, 252-6001
		16:15-16:40		Drive from airport to hotel	
					Distance covered - 87 km
<b>15-Mar-01</b>	<b>Thu</b>	9:00-10:00	Chishinau	Meeting at USAID	
		11:45-12:00		Drive from hotel to the railway station	Train #48, arriving in Kyiv at 00:38

Ukraine, March 16-24

<b>16-Mar-01</b>		16:30		Arrival in Kyiv, Zhuliany Airport	
			Dnipro Hotel	Hotel check-in	
<b>17-Mar-01</b>				Work on the evaluation report	
<b>24-Mar-01</b>					
<b>20-Mar-01</b>		14:30-15:50	Ministry of Emergencies of Ukraine	Meeting with Lt. Col. Volodymyr Ilyushchenko, Head International Relations Department, Col. Olexander Ivanov, Deputy Head Of Informational and Analytical Department, and Mr. Olexander Dobrogyrsky, Head Geographical Information Systems Section	Address: 55 Olesya Gonchara Street, contact tel. 247-3013, 247-3079
<b>24-Mar-01</b>		15:25	Boryspil Airport	Departure to USA via Zurich by Swissair flight 471	

E/Evaluation IQC Reports/Ukraine Humanitarian Assistance/Ukraine

**APPENDIX 3: GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS OF ASSESSMENT**

COUNTRY	OBLAST (PROVINCE)	RAION	CITY, TOWN, or VILLAGE
UKRAINE	Kyiv Municipality	Kharkivsky Raion	City of Kyiv
	Kyiv Oblast	Borodyansky Raion	Town of Babyntsi Town of Borodyanka
	Republic of Crimea	Simferopolsky Raion	City of Simferopol Village of Urozhaine Village of Perevalne Village of Baranovka Village of Stroganovka Village of Denisovka
		Pervomaysky Raion	Village of Sary-Bash
	Donetsk Oblast	(transit)	
	Luhansk Oblast	Krasnodon Raion	Town of Krasnodon
		Rubizhne Raion	City of Rubizhne
		Kreminsky Raion	City of Kreminna
	Sumy Oblast	Hlukhivsky Raion	Town of Shalyhyne City of Hlukhiv
	L'viv Oblast	(transit)	
	Ternopil Oblast	Ternopilsky Raion	Village of Petrykiv
MOLDOVA	Kishinau Municipality	Kishinau Municipality	City of Kishinau
	Kishinau Municipality	Kishinau Municipality	Town of Durlisht
	Belts Judetsul	Belts Municipality	City of Belts
	Edinets Judetsul	Edinets Raion	Village of Brynzen Village of Hincauts
	Lapushna Judetsul	Basarabeasca Raion	Town of Basarabeasca
	Autonomous Territorial Entity of Gagauzia (UTAG)	Chadyr-Lunga Raion	Town of Chadyr-Lunga
	Territorial Entity on the Left of Dnister (TransDnistria)	Dubasar Raion	Town of Dubasary Village of Cochyer
		Grigoriopol Raion	Town of Grigoriopol
		Tiraspol Municipality	City of Tiraspol

E:\Evaluation\QC Reports\Ukraine Humanitarian Assistance\Ukraine Final Appendix 3

April 2001

## Appendix 4: SCOPE OF WORK

### Assessment of the Humanitarian Assistance Program in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova

#### I. Purpose

The purpose of this assessment is to:

- analyze if the USAID/Kiev strategy is responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable people in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova;
- assess if the USAID-funded Humanitarian Assistance (HA) programs in the Western NIS region (Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus) adequately addressed the tasks set forth in the USAID/Kiev strategy as they relate to supporting the most vulnerable people in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova; and
- evaluate specific operations of CHAP in order to inform decision-makers as to whether there remains a need for a humanitarian assistance program and what form such a program should take to support USAID's overall assistance strategy in each country.

#### II. Background

USAID's humanitarian assistance program began in September 1994 through an unsolicited proposal from Counterpart International's Community Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP). The program was designed to help meet the basic needs of vulnerable people in West NIS, and relieve suffering during the transition to market-based democracies. Over \$120 million of U.S. assistance has been delivered to Ukraine, approximately \$39 million to Moldova and \$26 million to Belarus. The current program is scheduled to end on June 30, 2001.

	1994 (US\$)	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	In transit	TOTAL
Ukraine	1,327,950	3,657,643	21,215,269	15,552,910	20,187,348	39,638,881	16,848,718	2,084,797	120,513,519
Belarus	n/a	608,120	4,950,164	2,511,510	4,335,522	10,081,084	2,474,139	1,573,927	26,534,479
Moldova	1,670,371	447,960	2,322,952	4,325,213	7,147,304	12,310,617	9,359,580	1,541,141	39,125,142

The current humanitarian assistance program, implemented by CHAP, is intended to:

- respond to disasters as they occur and develop an emergency response capability among both governmental and non-governmental rescue organizations;
- support the most vulnerable groups -- disaster victims, the elderly, the disabled, children and youth, sick people, the destitute, veterans, private farmers, etc;
- accelerate the institutional development of qualified local social service and rescue non-governmental organizations (NGOs) by providing humanitarian assistance and infrastructural support to them and to their constituents; and
- support governmental social service providers such as hospitals, schools, orphanages, and boarding homes for the elderly and disabled; and

- support other U.S. PVOs who experience difficulties while trying to provide humanitarian assistance to needy populations in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.

CHAP carries out its mandate by:

- assessing the needs, selecting potential recipients and distribution partners, writing project justifications, and discussing projects with USAID;
- screening and staging the delivery of commodities from the U.S. and Europe;
- transporting commodities to Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova;
- monitoring the unloading, staging, customs clearance, and distribution of commodities;
- controlling end use (spot-checks); and
- leveraging U.S. government funds by shipping humanitarian assistance from other U.S. PVOs.

A description of CHAP implementation methods and method of monitoring to prevent misuse and abuse can be found in Appendix I; the Program's results and impact can be found in Appendix II.

### **III. Objectives of the Assessment**

#### **A. General Provision of Humanitarian Assistance to Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova**

1. Determine by country if the vulnerable groups and communities in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova continue to need outside support in the form of routine humanitarian assistance during non-emergency periods and if/when natural or man-made disasters occur.
2. Evaluate the achievements of other donors working in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova in the areas of responding to emergencies and provision of humanitarian assistance and needed supplies to the most vulnerable groups in Western NIS. Assess how donors have been able to coordinate their activities.

#### **B. CHAP-specific**

1. Determine if the level of program funding is adequate to achieve the results defined by the strategy.
2. Examine how the needs of the most vulnerable people have been evolving in the last six years and how the CHAP program has been able to modify itself to address those needs under the guidance from USAID/Kiev.
3. Determine if CHAP's implementation and monitoring of the program is preventing misuse and abuse of humanitarian assistance.
4. Assess the collaboration between CHAP and the working groups of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine HA Commission, the Ministry of Emergencies of Ukraine (MoE), the Department of HA under Presidential Administration of Belarus, the State Moldovan Commission for HA, and the State Moldovan Commission for HA distribution with the Ministry of Health.

5. Determine if the CHAP program is able to support other PVOs of the U.S. and other countries which endeavor to respond to disasters and provide assistance, but neither possess the experience of working in the difficult post-Soviet environment, nor have the local infrastructure to perform this work efficiently.
6. Determine the extent to which CHAP has achieved the objectives/results stated in the Grant; and appear reasonable to the evaluators.

#### **IV. Team Composition**

The assessment team will consist of two to three members:

- (1) All team members shall have a professional background in international development work, especially humanitarian assistance/disaster response, and preferably with experience in transitional, post-communist settings. The Team Leader must have previous experience in working on USAID assessments; leadership of a team; demonstrated analytical skills.
- (2) At least one team member should possess strong background knowledge of the region;
- (3) At least one team member should have experience in humanitarian assistance/disaster response work.

All team members should possess written and verbal communication skills. Fluency in Russian or Ukrainian/Belarusian/Romanian is highly desirable, but not required. USAID reserves the right to appoint a USAID/Kiev, USAID/Minsk, USAID/Chisinau and/or other USG employee(s) to act in the capacity of an observer or consultant where appropriate.

The Contractor will certify that there is no conflict of interest with respect to the performance of this assessment on the part of the contractor and the contractor's team members.

The Contractor will guarantee that substitutions will not be made for individuals selected as team members without the approval of USAID/Kiev, USAID/Minsk or USAID/Chisinau.

The Contractor will also assure that the approved team members will be available for the full period of the assessment. Site visits shall begin no later than February 1, 2001.

#### **V. Methodology**

In the United States the contractor shall:

1. Review background information documents including:
  - The Freedom Support Act
  - USAID assistance strategy for Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova (1999/2000)
  - USAID Congressional Presentations for Ukraine (at least 1998, 1999, 2000)

- R4 (Results Review and Resource Request) documents regarding Ukraine (at least for 1999 and 2000) and Semestral Activity Reports (SARs)
- Original grant with CHAP and all amendments
- Quarterly reports submitted by CHAP from September 26, 1994 to June 30, 2000
- Relevant HA legislation: Law of Ukraine on Humanitarian Assistance signed on October 22, 1999 (*USAID/Kiev can provide this information*), Moldovan and Belarussian legislative acts with regard to HA
- Review materials submitted by Counterpart International's management, e.g. History of CHAP and Counterpart International's Annual Reports (1994-1999).
- Other referential or historic documents

## 2. Review of CHAP - U.S. operations

Counterpart International's home office: Contact Mr. Gregory T. Touma, Chief Operating Officer and Vice-President for CHAP, Floor 11, 1200 18<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Washington, DC, 20036. Phone: 1-202-296-9676.

It is advised that the contractor receive an overview of CHAP's operations and methodology, including an introduction to CHAPBASE (database management system), contact Mr. Serhiy Zhgilov, Transportation Manager. Review U.S.-based operations activities should include, but not be limited to, the following aspects:

- a) Receiving Project Proposals and Justifications from the field
- b) Project approval process (matching supply and demand, obtaining transportation funding commitments)
- c) Acquisition of Commodities: Contact Mr. Richard Drolet, Director of Acquisitions
- d) Seeking material donations from U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) and private sources (outreach, checking for quality, etc.)
- e) Warehousing, preparing for loading and shipping
- f) Managing and tracking transportation overseas

## 3. Interview appropriate USAID staff of the E&E bureau as well as staff of the State Department's S/NIS/C office.

In Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova the contractor shall:

1. Meet with representatives of USAID and of CHAP in Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova upon arrival to discuss the approach and workplan in each country.
2. The contractor shall review the CHAP/WESTNIS field operations: contact Mr. Brian Propp, General Director, CHAP/WESTNIS, Suite 69, Floor 15, 8B Staronavodnytska Street, Kyiv, 01015, Ukraine, phone: [380] (44) 230-2346. The contractor shall study and analyze all the steps necessary for humanitarian assistance to reach the needy persons from entry into Ukraine, Belarus or Moldova. This would include the following:



- Offloading (if comes by sea or air), passing through boarder customs, transportation to the point of destination, warehousing, passing all sanitary and quality controls required by Ukrainian/Belarussian/Moldovan governments, distribution and monitoring to ensure proper use;
- Selecting a distribution partner;
- Determining the list of final recipients;
- Working with local customs authorities;
- Assisting other USG-supported organizations in their efforts to bring HA into Ukraine/Belarus/Moldova;
- Working on improvements in HA legislation;
- Timely response to natural and man made disasters as they occur; and
- Capacity-building of local governmental and private rescue teams, which also assume responsibility for responding to disasters.

The contractor shall undertake field visits and interviews with CHAP distribution partners and final recipients in all three countries. Since most of the actual HA work is performed outside of countries' capitals and in rural areas, the contractor is encouraged to divide its time accordingly. It is suggested that four days will be spent in Belarus and four days in Moldova. The contractor is encouraged to invite CHAP employees to field trips and interview while working in all three countries.

The Contractor shall present a summary of preliminary findings to USAID/Kiev, USAID/Chisinau, USAID/Minsk and field staff of CHAP prior to leaving Ukraine. Copies of the draft report with findings, conclusions and recommendations shall be left with the Mission for review and further comment.

## **VI. Schedule**

Three workdays will be required in Washington prior to departure to collect and review background materials and meet with USAID selected and Washington-based U.S. PVO staff who have been assisted by CHAP, identification of host country interviewees, scheduling appointments for field meetings; and team-building. The field evaluation will require a minimum of twelve workdays in Ukraine, four workdays in Belarus and four workdays in Moldova. At least three of these days will be needed to prepare the draft report and debrief USAID staff in ODS in Kiev. Up to one week (five workdays) will be required after receipt of USAID feedback in order to prepare the final report.

## **VII. In-country Logistics Support**

All logistical support will be provided by the Contractor to include travel, transportation, secretarial and office support, interpretation, report printing and communication, as appropriate.

## **VIII. Workweek**

A six-day workweek is authorized while in the field.

## IX. Deliverables

A. The contractor shall produce a final report, including separate sections for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova, which will include:

(1) Executive Summary:

A summary, not to exceed three single-spaced pages, should list, in order of priority, the major findings, conclusions, and lessons learned from the evaluation of overall HA program, provided by Counterpart/CHAP to the region and separately to Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus.

(2) Body of the Report (not to exceed 32 pages):

Generally, the report should be organized into "Findings," "Conclusions," and "Recommendations."

(3) Annexes:

Additional material should be submitted as Annexes, as appropriate (e.g. scope of work, bibliography of documents reviewed, list of agencies and persons interviewed, list of sites visited, etc.)

B. Reporting Procedures:

(1) Draft report:

An outbriefing and a copy of the draft report will be left with USAID/Kiev, USAID/Moldova, and USAID/Minsk prior to departure for Washington – in electronic as well as hard copy.

(2) Final Report:

Comments on the draft report, if any, will be returned to the contractor by USAID within seven days of receipt.

The contractor's final report, incorporating responses to any and all comments, shall be submitted to USAID/Kiev, USAID/Minsk, and USAID/Chisinau (an electronic copy; in addition, ten (10) copies of the final report -- nine bound and one loose leaf). Electronic copies of the draft and final reports will be presented on a diskette in the format "MSWORD 6.0 for Windows." The report should be no longer than 35 pages (excluding annexes).

## APPENDIX 5: Counterpart's Budget Summary of CHAP

(Note: This is a Counter part produced document with no modifications or editing by assessment team members.)

USAID Obligated Funding for the CHAP/WESTNIS Grant (as of 02/28/2001):

\$10,100,000

Original Grant		No-Cost Extension	Funded Extensions									
	9/26/94	2/4/96	12/31/96	6/30/97	12/31/97	6/30/98	12/31/98	6/30/99	12/31/99	6/30/00	12/31/00	6/30/01
Ukraine	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$600,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000		\$1,200,000		\$1,000,000		
Moldova			\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000		\$500,000		\$750,000			
Belarus			\$500,000		\$300,000		\$300,000		\$350,000			

WESTNIS	Total Funding Spent to date:	\$7,522,222
---------	------------------------------	-------------

Ukraine	\$124,000,000
Moldova	\$40,800,000
Belarus	\$28,200,000

WESTNIS	Total Assistance Delivered to date:	\$193,000,000
---------	-------------------------------------	---------------

Program Leveraging of USAID Funds (Assistance/Expenses):

26 to 1

## **APPENDIX 6: The History and Impact of USAID's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) implemented by Counterpart International, Inc., in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova (WESTNIS)**

(Note: This is a Counterpart-produced document with no modifications or editing by the assessment team members)

February 2000

### **HISTORY**

In 1993, USAID awarded to Counterpart International an NGO development grant that provided training and small grants to non-governmental organizations in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. Counterpart International was selected due to its more than 30 years of history providing social, technical, economic, and humanitarian assistance in the promotion of democratic development, free-market reforms, and social transitions.

In 1994, a major flood occurred in the Northwest-central region of Ukraine (mostly in and around Rivne Oblast). This same area had been contaminated with fallout from the Chornobyl catastrophe in 1986. The people living in the raions (counties) of these oblasts (provinces) were already suffering from health problems, economic collapse, high unemployment, low pensions, wage arrears, and contaminated agricultural land. The U.S. Department of State contracted with Counterpart International to provide deliveries of humanitarian assistance to the victims of the flooding. The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) donated the commodities that were distributed.

Being already familiar with Ukraine and its economic, demographic, political, social, cultural, and infrastructural characteristics, Counterpart recognized the need for humanitarian assistance throughout Ukraine and other former Soviet republics. During the prolonged and difficult transition to a free-market system and democratic society, many people simply lose the means to survive. The social safety net was not only worn thin, but also had gaping holes in it. In some aspects, the safety net had collapsed. Even ten years after independence, it has not been restructured.

Some would argue that people need not rely on a governmentally provided social safety net; that they need to take responsibility for themselves. This is a worthy, idealistic goal, and is the foundation of all USAID programs; institutional development and self-sufficiency are among the objectives for each project. However, in the short-term, many people, particularly the elderly, invalids, and disadvantaged children, are simply not capable of making a rapid or smooth transition to a completely different social, political, and economic system. After 75 years of communism, and hundreds of years of feudalism before that, the people are not mentally or emotionally equipped to understand, accept, and adjust to radically different concepts quickly. It is to be expected that over ninety percent (90%) of the population will require a decade or more to make the necessary adjustments in their attitudes and behaviors so that they can become self-sufficient contributors to the redevelopment of the nation. It is expected that forty to fifty percent (40% - 50%) will simply never make the transition. Only the passing of one or more generations, with constant encouragement from Western democracies, will make it possible for the former Soviet republics to redesign their futures.

Until millions of jobs are created with domestic and foreign investment, the Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Moldovan governments will not have sufficient tax revenues to be able to reconstruct any semblance of a social safety net for pensioners, invalids, orphans, etc. Meanwhile, these people need to survive. If aid is not provided continually during the transition period, a humanitarian crisis will result.

Acutely aware of this situation and outlook, Counterpart International submitted to USAID an unsolicited proposal to help alleviate the suffering by providing continual deliveries and distributions of humanitarian assistance (HA) to the most vulnerable people during the transition period. The following concepts were proposed:

1. Help meet the basic needs of the most vulnerable people;
2. Serve them through non-governmental and governmental social service providers;
3. Help those organization grow and develop by providing:
  - a. Infrastructural support;
  - b. Additional credibility with members and within their community;
  - c. Ability to serve more members, larger areas, more services, or better services;
  - d. Exposure and experience in transparent procedures and Western methodologies;
  - e. In selected cases, combine material assistance with small grants and training provided by other assistance programs, thereby leveraging institutional development mechanisms;
6. Provide rapid assistance to victims of disasters;
7. Improve the ability of civil defense, rescue services, and emergency workers to adequately respond to disasters and prevent loss of lives and property.

Corresponding with the collapse of the Soviet system, which created the demand for material, technical, and economic assistance, the U.S. Department of Defense began downsizing, creating the supply of excess property. The Counterpart proposal envisioned using excess property from U.S. defense bases that were being closed or downsized throughout Europe and the United States to assist needy people in the former Soviet republics. What was once stockpiled to defend the West from possible Soviet aggression could be used to help the former Soviet citizens rebuild their lives after the collapse. The end of the Cold War offered a huge peace dividend in the form of much needed humanitarian assistance. Donations from private sources, such as corporations and charitable organizations, would also be solicited.

USAID, recognizing the needs of the country, the logic of the program, and the professional abilities of Counterpart, agreed to fund the program. USAID was especially interested in the ability of the program to leverage the efforts of other programs, and the internal leveraging provided by the program itself. For every dollar of USAID budget money spent, more than ten dollars of assistance could be provided to needy Ukrainian, Belarusian, and Moldovan people.

In addition, USAID and the U.S. Embassy recognized the need for a rapid response capability to get U.S.-provided assistance to disaster victims. A well equipped, fully implemented, ongoing program would enable the U.S. Government to respond immediately to emergency requests, something the Embassy could not do with its limited staff.

USAID's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) was started on September 26, 1994, and is expected to continue as long as it is needed to help meet the basic needs of vulnerable people and relieve suffering during the transition. Since the inception of the program, it has become extremely efficient and has provided assistance to every oblast and nearly every raion in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. As of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 20000 more than \$ 187 million of U.S. assistance has been delivered with USAID budget expenditures of only \$7.5 million, creating leveraging of more than 20 to 1.

#### **PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND METHOD OF MONITORING TO PREVENT MISUSE AND ABUSE**

Counterpart's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) has developed and implemented excellent procedures to select recipients, track commodities from the donors to the end users, and monitor use. CHAP conducts professional monitoring of donations, not for the sake of monitoring, but to prevent misuse and abuse of donated commodities. The goal is to make sure that humanitarian assistance helps the people it is intended to help. The process starts not with spot-checks, but with proper selection of recipients, needs assessment, and matching distributions to need. Consequently, much misuse and abuse is prevented by making the system, as much as possible, "demand-pull" rather than "supply-push."

CHAP asks each prospective recipient to complete a five-page questionnaire. This detailed document helps CHAP determine if the organization is truly needy, if they can meet their needs in other ways, if they are receiving assistance from other sources, and precisely what their needs are, in priority order. It also helps CHAP understand what resources they have, what services they provide and to whom, what geographic area they serve, and how well their services are focused to their mission. Since some concepts are new to many parts of the world, the questionnaire asks them to confirm with their signature that items donated will not be sold, traded, or bartered, and that CHAP has the right to conduct random spot-checks to ensure compliance.

The questionnaire also seeks to answer the question, "What impact will this assistance have on your organization and the constituents you serve?" Will they be able to provide more or new services? Will they be able to help more people? Will they be able to serve a larger geographic area? Will they be able to provide higher quality services?

CHAP also requests copies of the organization's registration certificate and statutes. Once it is determined, after reviewing the questionnaire and other documents submitted, that the organization meets the criteria for assistance, a site visit is scheduled to verify information and conduct needs assessment. During the site-visit, the concept of prohibition against selling, trading, or bartering is discussed in detail.

If the prospective recipient passes all these tests, then they are given a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) to sign. The MoA is a contract that states the conditions under which they will receive donated commodities, and states the responsibilities of the parties. It also includes the statement that the items are not allowed to be sold, traded, or bartered, and that Counterpart or anyone designated by Counterpart has the right to conduct random spot-checks to ensure compliance. The MoA also contains an indemnification clause to protect the donors and Counterpart.

Once the MoA is executed, the prospective recipient can be included in the distribution plan for appropriate items. All distribution plans must be approved by the General Director of CHAP, and the distribution partner. When distribution takes place, the recipient must sign a detailed receipt. The receipt also contains a paragraph regarding the prohibition against selling, trading, or bartering items. This is at least the fourth time they are exposed to this concept. The receipt must also be signed by a witness, such as the distribution partner, and by the CHAP Project Director supervising the distribution.

If any of the items are to be distributed to the constituents of the organization, rather than to be used by the organization itself, then the organization is given forms to be used to document the redistribution. The forms state who the donor is. The organization is responsible for completing the forms and obtaining the full name, address, telephone number, and signature of each recipient, indicating the items and quantities received. These completed lists are to be submitted to CHAP.

In addition, major distributions are well publicized so that the general public knows what was donated by whom and to whom. Widespread knowledge about a project serves as a deterrent to abuse.

The procedures outlined above are designed to prevent misuse and abuse, and these procedures have proven to be very effective methods. However, the teeth of the program is that CHAP conducts random spot-checks. In Ukraine alone, CHAP conducts about 600 spot-checks per year. Spot-checks are conducted by CHAP personnel and, when available, U. S. Peace Corps Volunteers, USAID and U. S. Embassy personnel, and Ukrainian government inspectors.

Spot-checks are conducted in a consistent manner using a simple bilingual form. The spot-checker is provided with copies of all receipts showing all items received by the subject organization. The spot-checker visits the organization and attempts to verify that all items received are accounted for and being used properly. If necessary, redistribution reports are reviewed and verified. Individual recipients are chosen at random and called or visited to verify that they received the noted items. This is also a good opportunity to develop additional goodwill between the donors and the recipients, and to document with stories and photographs the impact made by the donated commodities.

All inconsistencies are investigated until resolved. If necessary, host country authorities are called-in to assist with investigations. CHAP takes the responsibility of monitoring donated commodities very seriously. CHAP's well-designed and established procedures serve to keep our employees, volunteers, partners, and recipients honest. The goal is continually reached: to make sure that humanitarian assistance helps the people it is intended to help.

## **RESULTS AND IMPACT**

USAID's CHAP has been instrumental in relieving suffering caused by disasters and the economic, political, and social transition. In addition, local social service organizations and emergency service providers are better equipped to respond to the needs of their constituents. This is essential in the proper development of a democratic and civil society.

### **Assistance to Victims of Disasters**

Unfortunately, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova frequently experience natural and manmade disasters. For example, every year has proven that Ukraine's geographic location, terrain, and decayed infrastructure exposes her to greater risk of floods, landslides, windstorms, industrial accidents, mine explosions and cave-ins, and unusual consequences. An interesting example is the flood that occurred in Kharkiv in the summer of 1995. What started as a flood due to heavy rainfall developed into a severe sewage disaster and health threat due to decayed infrastructure at a sewage pump station. CHAP distributed five cargo plane loads of humanitarian assistance, including medical supplies and meals-ready-to-eat, to the victims and emergency workers. Just like the rest of Ukraine, Kharkiv was already experiencing a poor economy. They could not afford a disaster. This U.S.

assistance program helped the victims recover from loss of property and total economic turmoil. It also helped the Health Department handle the increase in cases of cholera, dysentery, and other diseases.

Another typical example is a heavy rainfall in the Transcarpathian region (Zakarpattia Oblast) which occurred in November 1998 and caused over a hundred villages, towns, and cities to be flooded. Many homes, and even some schools and hospitals, were buried in mudslides. Over 40,000 people were directly affected, and the effects were long-lasting. One devastating consequence was that their winter food crops and storage cellars were completely wiped out. CHAP was able to respond immediately on behalf of the U.S. Government. American assistance was rapidly redirected from other ongoing projects to serve the region within 48 hours. Additional assistance was ordered from CHAP operations in Europe and the U.S. Over \$4 million of U.S. assistance, including clothing, boots, blankets, tents, sleeping bags, medical supplies, and emergency generators, enabled the victims and emergency workers to survive the winter and rebuild their lives.

In 2000, CHAP continued to carry out its mission providing direct tangible assistance to families that were victimized by the explosion in the Barakov Mine accident in Krasnodon, Luhansk Oblast. Counterpart International distributed blankets, coats, jackets, bed sheets, women's slacks, and men's pajama trousers to the families of the miners that were either killed or wounded in the terrible explosion at Barakov mine. The assistance distributed has been valued at over \$46,000 and helped serve in total three hundred and seventy-five (375) constituents in the eighty-eight (88) families. In addition to clothes, forty-two (42) refrigerators, twenty-nine (29) television sets, and sixteen (16) washing machines were bought by Counterpart International from LG Company using the \$25,000 endorsed by the U. S. Embassy and USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) to provide support to the grieved families.

Also, in July 2000, as a result of adverse weather conditions (heavy showers, squall winds, hail, and tornado), nine oblasts (provinces) of Ukraine encountered severe damage. Hundreds of buildings were destroyed and thousands of people received serious bodily injuries. The overall damages have amounted to 827 residential areas in different oblasts left without electricity. The tornado consequences resulted in the worst power outage of the major network lines in Western and North-Western parts of Ukraine in the last twenty-five years. The damage to the communications network was huge: the affected regions temporarily lost their telephone connection with the rest of Ukraine; automatic telephone exchanges were not operating; kilometers of cable lines were considerably damaged.

Responding immediately to the emergency situation, USAID/CHAP has arranged to donate pumps, generators, clothing, pharmaceuticals, footwear, cloth, and medical items to Ternopil Oblast Charity and Health Foundation and Drohobych Department of International Charitable Foundation of Technogenic Safety of Ukraine (L'viv Oblast). These items helped the affected regions alleviate the damage to public and private property, and to help the victims recover from their losses and survive the difficult period.

More recently, in November-December 2000, the southeast part of Ukraine was severely hit by a storm with heavy rains and frost. In the worst affected areas, a layer of ice reaching 15 cm in diameter covered tree branches, telephone, and electricity cables. This caused great damages in twelve oblasts of Ukraine. Again CHAP used all available resources to provide assistance to recipients in the most affected areas. As part of this initiative, two 40-foot containers with medical supplies and warm clothing, including cold-weather shirts, skirts, liners, and trousers, were directed to Odesa and Vinnitsa Oblasts to assist in mitigating the consequences of the disaster. The cargoes with warm clothing were transported to Odesa to help disaster victims and emergency relief workers. Providing immediate and tangible support to the victims, CHAP allocated articles of warm clothing to vulnerable children at nineteen (19) boarding homes and schools in the poorest and most remote raions of Southern Ukraine.

Below is a complete list of disasters that the U.S. Government has been able to respond to via USAID's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova (WESTNIS):

1. Rivne Flood -- 1994
2. Moldova Flood -- 1994
3. Kharkiv Flood and Sewage Pump Station crisis -- 1995
4. Kyiv Flood -- 1996
5. Mykolayiv Flood -- 1996
6. L'viv Flood -- 1996
7. Kolomiya Flood -- 1997
8. Moldova Flood -- 1996
9. Dnipropetrovsk Landslide -- 1997
10. Brest Oblast Tornado, Belarus -- 1997
11. Moldova Mudslides -- 1997
12. Donetsk Mine Explosion -- 1997
13. Zakarpatia Flood and Mudslides -- 1998-1999
14. Barakov Mine Explosion, Luhansk Oblast -- 2000
15. Drohobych Chemical Pipeline Disaster, L'viv Oblast -- 2000
16. L'viv and Ternopil Oblasts Tornado -- 2000
17. CHAP is currently helping the victims of the recent ice storm severely affected communities in Southern Ukraine and Northern Moldova.

More than XX two million lives have been touched by the U.S. Government's disaster assistance in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. The U.S. Government simply would not be able to react rapidly and effectively if USAID's CHAP was not already staffed, experienced, and operational to handle the complicated logistics of planning, acquisition, transportation, delivery, customs clearance, distribution, and monitoring.

#### Assistance to Vulnerable Groups

CHAP tracks and provides assistance to the following categories of vulnerable people: children and teenagers at risk, orphans, large families, laborers, farmers, elderly, sick, veterans, blind people, deaf people, minorities, repressed people, invalids, mentally disabled, physically disabled, Chornobyl victims, disaster victims, alcoholics and drug addicts, poor people, homeless people, street children, students, pensioners, women at risk, and refugees. The focus of the program is on

vulnerable children, invalids, and elderly people. Additionally, CHAP seeks to provide as much assistance as possible to rural areas and regions often overlooked by international donors.



CHAP conducts two types of projects: general deliveries to vulnerable groups within an oblast (province); and, special initiatives. Special initiatives include projects that serve specific types of constituents nationwide, such as orphanages or hospitals; and, projects that respond to disasters, as described above. These can also be called "thematic projects."

The "Chornobyl + 10 Project" is a special initiative undertaken by CHAP in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the Chornobyl disaster on April 26, 1996. This huge project allowed the U.S. Government to help over one million victims of the Chornobyl disaster throughout the most affected regions of Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. More than \$15 million worth of medical supplies, pharmaceuticals, clothing, and other items were distributed during this massive project which included three airlifts and more than sixty containers.

Another good example is a project implemented with the Ukrainian Ministry of Labor and Social Policy to provide clothing, furniture, bedding, and medical supplies to all 279 orphanages and boarding houses for invalids within the Ministry in Ukraine. This project, conducted in 1996 and 1997, provided over \$10 million worth of American assistance to the 55,000 residents of these institutions.

In August 1999, under "Kharkiv Special Initiative" Project CHAP helped the U.S. Department of State implement a huge medical airlift. Two cargo planes with more than \$8.5 million of privately-donated pharmaceuticals, including over 70,000 hepatitis B vaccines, were offloaded and distributed to more than eighty (80) hospitals in the Kharkiv Oblast. This project helped the U.S. Government fulfill some of its commitments to the Kharkiv Oblast in conjunction with the cancellation of the TurboAtom sales contract. In addition, the success of the project helped secure negotiations for other desired Kharkiv Initiative projects.

A more recent example is CHAP's airlift of approximately \$8.5 million worth of medicines and supplies to the Republic of Moldova. In fact, it is considered one of the largest single United States humanitarian assistance projects for the country since its independence. In 2000 this project has delivered about 120 containers of medical equipment and supplies that have been distributed to 150 hospitals and clinics throughout Moldova. United States military medical experts coordinated distribution and installation of the donated medical equipment and provided necessary technical assistance and training sessions for local hospital personnel. Counterpart International was assisted in this effort by other private voluntary organizations, namely "Heart to Heart", "Citihope International", and "Carelift International". These organizations were responsible for obtaining the medicines from U.S. Pharmaceutical Companies. A critical element of support within the overall project was the provision of approximately \$500,000 in equipment and supplies for the current World Bank health reform project to develop primary health care clinics. On the whole, this support helped equip 36 primary care clinics.

A special initiative was also All-Ukrainian Assistance to Schools Project implemented by USAID/CHAP in 2000. Majority of Ukrainian administrative units have been served in the framework of the aforementioned project. In total, Counterpart International has delivered fifteen

(15) forty-foot containers with 415,770 yards of high-quality blue, wool-blend cloth valued at nearly \$4,430,870. The donated cloth was used to manufacture school uniforms for the most needy children at boarding schools, orphans at secondary and vocational schools, totally serving about 193,300 students all over Ukraine.

Implementing Wheelchairs Project CHAP supported invalids with locomotive problems in Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. The shipments in the framework of the aforementioned project included excellent quality wheelchairs donated by Wheelchairs for the World Foundation, California. The assistance has been distributed to hundreds of physically disabled people in WESTNIS region. This commodity provided them the means to be mobile and engage in normal daily activities. Most invalids did not have a sufficient amount of money to buy vitally needed facilities, and such assistance was very timely. The new wheelchairs, made in conformance with the modern technologies and of modern materials, proved to be extremely high-quality and durable appliances. It is expected to continue this initiative through the year 2001.

Many other special initiatives have provided Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova with tens of thousands of new medical and educational textbooks, fire-fighting equipment, ambulances, tools and equipment for small private farmers'

associations, winter apparel, and emergency rescue vehicles and equipment. These projects raise the level of services provided by local indigenous organizations, and raise the level of awareness of America's strategic partnership with Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova.

General deliveries or "regional projects" of humanitarian assistance have helped millions of vulnerable people throughout the three-country region. Over 5,000 organizations have received American assistance from CHAP. For example, CHAP's recent delivery of huge bread-baking ovens, valued at over \$250,000, enabled a boarding house and a territorial center in Khmelnytsky and Ternopil Oblasts to feed thousands of needy and vulnerable people such as orphans, children-invalids, large and low-income families, and pensioners. To assist with installation Counterpart sent expert oven installer, who trained local Ukrainian technicians and operators how to properly assemble, maintain, and use the ovens.

Every province of all WESTNIS countries has been assisted, as well as nearly every county-level territory. For example, Ukraine's population of 50 million people (in an area a bit larger than Texas) is scattered throughout 30,000 cities, towns, and villages in nearly 700 raions. U.S. assistance has reached most of these villages, and many more will be assisted during the next few years, as needed. Unfortunately, the need will likely continue for several more years, as Ukraine is slow to adopt the reforms prescribed by USAID and other international experts.

**For more information about Counterpart International's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP), please contact:**

**Brian Richard Propp, General Director, CHAP  
Floor 5, 26 Lesya Ukrainka Boulevard  
City of Kyiv, Pechersk Raion, Kyiv Municipality, 01133, Ukraine**

**Telephone: [380] (44) 573-8636. Fax: [380] (44) 230-2586.  
E-mail: [brian@chap.freenet.kiev.ua](mailto:brian@chap.freenet.kiev.ua).**

## **APPENDIX 7: Counterpart International's Community And Humanitarian Assistance Program Response to Zakarpattia Flood, Winter-Spring 2001**

**(Note: This is a Counterpart-produced document with no modifications or editing by the assessment team members)**

Immediately after Counterpart International's Community and Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) received first notification about flood in Zakarpattia, it deployed to the affected area its project director Ivan Gurzhy, who arrived to Zakarpattia on March 7 and distributed there first lot of needed items (rubberized cloth, cold-weather shirts, and rubber overshoes, and gloves). He evaluated situation there and contacted representatives the Ministry of Emergencies, Zakarpattia Oblast State Administration, and raion administrations to obtain the most current and full information about the scale of emergency and needs of the effected people.

Major deliveries to the area:

On March 7: The town of Chop, Ukraine received 223 yards of water resistant cloth, 30 pairs of rubber overshoes, 150 brown cold-weather shirts and 150 pairs of gloves worth approximately \$10,175. These items were received by the consignee - UkrTechnoBezpeka, Drohobych Branch in L'viv Oblast and then diverted to Zakarpattia. As there is no way to get to the Town of Chop by the usual vehicle, Counterpart left these commodities with Uzhgorod City Administration and they would took water resistant cloth, rubber boots, and clothing to Chop that night by a special truck to supplement efforts of rescuers who tried to protect the city from rising water.

On March 15, 360 sleeping bags were sent to Zakarpattia from our on-going project in Sumy. The sleeping bags are worth a total of \$40,032. They reached their destination on March 16. \$600 have been spent from USAID/OFDA fund to pay for transportation.

On March 16, USAID/OFDA signed a grant agreement with CHAP and on March 18 provided Counterpart with \$25,000 for local purchase of commodities. So far, four (4) rubber inflatable boats and two (2) engines, 28 life vests for boats, 320 blankets, 330 pillows, and 320 mattresses were purchased with these funds. Boats, engines, and vests have been shipped to Zakarpattia by railway and will be there on March 23. Blankets, pillows, and mattresses will be delivered to Zakarpattia on March 22. CHAP paid \$20,000 from USAID/OFDA fund to purchase above mentioned commodities.

100 sleeping bags and 1,000 canteen cups worth \$16,320 are loaded today to be send to emergency zone from the CHAP's project in Kherson. Expected day of arrival – March 23. US Department of State suggested to send 100,000 Humanitarian Daily Rations located in Norfolk, VA. We expect them to be released by next Tuesday (March 27). S/NIS/C is considering flying them to Europe and then trucking to Ukraine.

CHAP had also screened 900 folding beds in Pirmasens, Germany. The beds will be loaded on March 26, and we expect some 4-5 additional days of transit before they get to the destination.

Counterpart will continue to provide items to those in need as soon as they become available. It is hoped that the aid provided will alleviate the suffering endured by the residents of the flooded areas. I will continue to update you on the assistance provided by Counterpart as new information becomes available. Targeted population should be identified based on data provided by the Ministry of Emergencies, local authorities, and through local surveys.

All the screened and purchased commodities will be transported to the stricken oblast and delivered to the warehouse of *Skhid Sontsia* (Sunrise) Invalid's Union of Vynohradivsky Raion, Zakarpattia Oblast. This organization has all necessary characteristics to be chosen as a local consignee and distribution partner. It is accredited with the local customs service, registered with the Humanitarian Assistance Commission under the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, and possesses dry warehouse facilities big enough to accommodate all the aforementioned cargoes. *Skhid Sontsia* will provide all of its services free of charge.

The deliveries of humanitarian assistance will be managed by the CHAP office in Kyiv, CHAP's project director who is already being deployed to the affected area, and staff of *Skhid Sontsia* Invalid's Union. Counterpart will collaborate with *Skhid Sontsia* Invalid's Union to prepare and implement distribution plans. An all-terrain vehicle will be rented through the grant to do actual deliveries of commodities to disaster victims. Purchased boats will allow reaching the most remote places cut off from the main roads by high water. Boats will be used to relocate people and deliver them items being distributed.

100,000 humanitarian daily rations will be distributed to those people who lost their food stocks flooded by high water. Sleeping bags, folding beds, blankets, pillows and mattresses will go to relocated people who do not have appropriate means to sleep on and stay warm. They will be distributed, first of all, among those who lost their houses.

These estimations are based on CHAP preliminary findings in the emergency stricken area, correspond with high-priority needs of disaster victims, and will supplement efforts of the government and other donors.